

and a member of the Ways and Means Committee. One personal belief to which I adhere very strongly is that true progress in this area can only be achieved through a partnership of Government and the private sector seeking a policy that is both balanced and equitable. Such a partnership and such a policy goal have contributed so much to the great economic gains of the American economy. These gains, while familiar to most, are impressive and thus worthy of some review by me here again.

In the past 3½ years of the Johnson Administration, our economy has grown at a rate of about 4.9% a year in real terms, and the value of our goods and services has increased by some \$170 billion, more than the total gross national product of Italy and France combined; almost 8.7 million non-farm jobs have been added, and unemployment has been cut by 1.1 million people; some four million people are estimated to have been lifted out of poverty; personal income, after taxes, has grown by 30%; corporate profits, after taxes, have increased 35%.

All of these gains have helped produce the longest postwar business upturn in U.S. history. This great economic accomplishment could not have been made except for a growing sense of partnership between American business and American Government striving for a balanced and equitable economic policy.

As an essential part of the total economic picture, the business of finance should likewise be developed by balanced and equitable policies. For these policies are like an investment portfolio. They are not something which we can acquire and then stow away in a safe and forget. They need watching and revising.

With this in mind, I would like to discuss today some areas where the need to achieve a policy of balance and equity is of great importance in the future.

THE TAX SURCHARGE

First and foremost of these areas from the standpoint of current national interest is the 10% tax surcharge that President Johnson has recommended. To be sure, there are a host of vital economic considerations that must be weighed by Congress before taking action on the President's proposal. I haven't committed myself yet on the proposal, but, in my mind a most important consideration—one which I know you here are very interested in—is what might happen in the financial markets without the tax increase.

One of the important questions posed in the Committee's present public hearings is whether or not the financial markets can tolerate the kind of demand for money they would receive in this current fiscal year from a Federal deficit of the size that would emerge without the proposed tax surcharge. Many of the witnesses have voiced the opinion that without enactment of the surcharge, market pressure would cause an interest rate escalation similar to, if not worse than, what occurred last year.

President Johnson voiced the Administration's rather solemn prediction on this specific point in his August 3 message to Congress; and I quote:

"Spiraling interest rates and severely tight money would return.

"What the Government does not raise through taxes, the Government must borrow.

"That additional borrowing would be imposed on financial markets already strained

by the unprecedented demands of private borrowers and State and local governments. Long-term interest rates are already near their peaks of late last summer, and short-term rates have begun to climb.

"Without a tax increase, I am informed by Chairman Martin that nothing the Federal Reserve System could responsibly do could avoid the spiraling of interest rates.

"As interest rates rose, a starvation of mortgage funds would throw housing into a new depression before it had even recovered from the last one.

"Every other borrower—but most of all the small businessman and the farmer—would bear the cost of our fiscal irresponsibility."

One of the explicit goals of the Administration's surtax proposal is, therefore, to achieve measurable progress in bringing about equity and balance in the nation's financial markets—to enhance the prospects of more stable and sound conditions in such markets in the months that lie ahead.

Representatives of the savings and loan industry have already appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in the public hearings now being conducted on the President's proposal. You may be assured that their testimony, which is generally favorable to the surtax, and that of all the other witnesses that come before the Committee in these current hearings will be given very careful consideration before any action is taken.

The Committee incidentally will complete its schedule of public hearings around the middle of this month. As you know, the legislative step that next follows will be executive sessions in the Committee in which the initial, very difficult legislative decisions on the surtax recommendation will have to be made.

FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

I would also like to discuss an item which is of particular interest to you—and that involves the chartering of Federal mutual savings banks. Some feel that a very good case can be made that such a move would be in the public interest. The argument is advanced that Federal mutual savings banks can potentially enhance the mobility of savings in response to investment needs, and can contribute to a stronger system of mutual thrift institutions.

But I am aware also that a question has been raised whether the present tax treatment of mutual savings banks is adequate.

Let me review the tax question for you.

Prior to the Revenue Act of 1962, mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations were virtually exempt from Federal income tax. By that Act, the Congress sought to correct the income tax provisions applicable to mutual thrift institutions generally. It provided a comprehensive set of rules governing the tax deductibility of additions to a reserve for bad debts and, with respect to savings and loan associations but not mutual savings banks, Congress enacted a detailed definitional requirement based on the nature of the lending functions of savings and loan associations.

As a result of that legislation, tax payments of \$168 million from savings and loan associations and \$32 million from mutual savings banks were anticipated. In fact, 1963 tax payments were \$116 million from savings and loan associations and only \$3 million from mutual savings banks. With respect to mutual savings banks, this situation has not improved significantly since 1963, I am told.

Some feel that the tax and chartering issues are naturally linked. If we are to broaden the powers of mutuals by allowing them Federal charter, perhaps concomitant legislative action should be considered to insure that these institutions carry, commensurately, a fair share of the tax burden compared with other financial institutions. A policy of equity, balance, and uniformity toward financial institutions would seem to me to necessitate such a consideration.

Thus far, I have discussed areas where balance and equity are necessary standards for future policy making. I would now like to turn to a final example, but one in which it appears such standards have been well applied. This involves the regulation of interest rates by Federal authorities.

As you all well remember, I'm sure, interest rates early last year began escalating sharply after December 1965 when the Federal Reserve Board allowed commercial banks to pay up to 5½% instead of 4½% on time deposits.

The repercussions of this move for financial institutions were great as a war for savings and time deposits developed. As 1966 progressed, the developing pressures suggested more clearly the need for a policy that would moderate the impact of rising interest rates and increased rate competition on thrift institutions, the mortgage market, and home building activity. It also became increasingly clear that Government authorities did not have the powers to maintain the competition for savings on a sound basis and avoid the excesses of unrestrained competition.

As a result, legislation was approved by the Congress and signed by President Johnson on September 21 that gave the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation temporary authority to set different rates on time deposits according to their size and other criteria. It also gave the Federal Home Loan Bank Board temporary authority to set interest ceilings on savings shares of insured savings and loan associations.

This legislation, by and large, contributed significantly to a moderation in the excessive competition for consumer savings and facilitated in an increased flow of funds into thrift institutions. In short, it worked. While I am aware of some limited competitive problems that developed, I believe the action illustrates the effectiveness of a balanced and equitable Government policy—both in terms of its aims and results—that should be sought.

In closing, may I emphasize that the task of carefully watching over our financial policies and their use is a task that every responsible group and every thoughtful citizen must share with the Government in partnership to realize the full potential of the American economy in the years ahead.

We know that financial policies, unless periodically reviewed and reformed, can become slipshod, develop grave defects, and can become obsolescent in a way which can both act as a barrier to sound economic growth and at the same time check popular faith and morale. We cannot let this happen.

The need to modernize financial policy in a balanced and equitable way is, of course, a long term concern. And I would hope and expect the thrift industry to play a vital and leading role in the achievement of this goal.

Thank you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let not your heart be troubled; believe in God.—John 14: 1.

Let us pray.

O God, our Father, who are ever seeking to strengthen Thy children, make us strong as we face the arduous tasks of

this day and as we carry the heavy responsibilities placed upon us—keeping freedom alive in our world and promoting justice and good will among our people. Give to us the faith which will enable us to meet fearlessly the forces of tyranny which threaten to engulf us.

Bless the Members of this body. Lead them in their labors, direct them in their decisions, fortify their faith, strengthen their spirits, elevate their endeavors that they may lead our Nation into wider areas of truth and righteousness and good will.

Bless our men and women in the service of our country—many exposed to danger and death. Heal the wounded, strengthen the prisoners, relieve the suffering, and comfort the sorrowing. Hasten the day when nations will learn to live together in peace and good will.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arington, one its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

- S. 653. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crisp, U.S. Air Force; and
- S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 1880. An act to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; and
- S. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 43d biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1872, THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1872) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. HAYS, ADAIR, MAILLIARD, and FRELINGHUYSEN.

PURCHASE OF A RETAINING RING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE FROM THE BENDIX CORP. IN TOWSON, MD., FOR \$2.30 APIECE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House considered a \$74 billion Department of Defense appropriation bill and concluded it would be pretty stupid if we bought anything outside America. Sometimes it is pretty stupid when we buy things inside America.

Here is a little item called a retaining ring which the Air Force this year bought from the Bendix Corp. in Towson, Md., for \$2.30 apiece. They could have bought them for 43 cents apiece, but the really sad thing is that they did not need to buy them at all. They were not only already in stock in the Defense Industrial Supply Center in Memphis, Tenn., but they have been in stock for so long without moving that most of them have been described as "disposable excess." I am afraid that no matter where the Department of Defense spends our money there is some "disposable excess" in it.

SOUTHEAST ASIAN SUPPORT FOR THE AMERICAN POSITION IN VIETNAM

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, an intense debate has been going on for the last year about America's commitments in Vietnam. A vast majority say we must remain and carry out our commitments. A small but vocal minority say that we must withdraw unilaterally.

But in this great debate, hardly anyone bothers to consult those most immediately threatened by Communist expansion in Asia. What do they think? The people of Southeast Asia are almost unanimous in their support of the American presence in South Vietnam.

The Prime Minister of Singapore said some months ago that if the Americans leave Vietnam, "we're finished."

The Prime Minister of Malaysia has said the American presence "has made the difference" between Asian stability and Asian chaos.

The President of the Philippines, the Prime Minister of Australia, the leaders of Thailand and Cambodia have all echoed similar sentiments.

We are not alone in South Vietnam. There is strong support for our policies and our intentions throughout Southeast Asia. The United States is looked upon as the only nation with the resources and commitment to prevent a step-by-step takeover of the area by communism.

NO GUERRILLA WARFARE IN TEXAS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, last night's papers quoted the Governor of Michigan to the effect that this country faces a serious threat of guerrilla warfare. I recognize that the trend of decisions by our Federal courts, particularly and especially by our Supreme Court, might logically lead one to this conclusion. But, I am sure that on reflection, we all realize that guerrilla warfare—and I might say looting and mass stealing—occurs only where the would-be guerrillas have reason to believe that they will not actually be treated as guerrillas upon apprehension.

Certainly, there is a danger of guerrilla warfare in any State where the Governor lacks the judgment and fortitude to enforce the laws. But there will be no guerrilla warfare where a State has a Governor who has the fortitude, the judgment, and the strength to assure any prospective guerrillas that they will be treated as guerrillas.

It is not my purpose to condemn or criticize the administration of any State, and I will not pass judgment beyond the borders of my home State. But in Texas we have a State administration which in my judgment has the fortitude and the determination to enforce the laws—all the laws—and we anticipate no guerrilla warfare in Texas.

MEETING OF PRESIDENT'S CABINET COMMITTEE ON THE AFFAIRS OF MEXICAN-AMERICANS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear that the Honorable Vicente Ximenez, Chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee on the Affairs of Mexican-Americans, has, after consultation with the President at the White House, announced a meeting of said Committee to be held at El Paso, Tex., on October 27 and 28. Commissioner Ximenez stated that all members of the Committee would attend, and it is hoped that the President also will be in attendance.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19, 1966, during a discussion of the problems of the Mexican-Americans, among other things I called for such a meeting. When Commissioner Ximenez was appointed to the Committee I again asked that such a meeting be held and invited them to have it in the 15th Congressional District of Texas. I regret that it was not possible to have it there, but I respectfully yield to the logic of having it at El Paso, and I am today informing Commissioner Ximenez of my utmost cooperation in this endeavor and of my best wishes for a fruitful and very successful meeting.

THE QUESTION WHETHER ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE IS NECESSARY FOR EFFECTIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT BROUGHT RENEWED DISCUSSION ON THE FLOOR OF CONGRESS TODAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Republican task force on crime and another group of Republicans issued separate papers urging passage of court-supervised bugging and wiretapping. The GOP statement called the wiretap legislation a necessary tool for effective law enforcement. The Justice Department wants it too—but only when the President and Attorney General decide it is necessary.

The Justice Department now says that FBI-investigated organized crime convictions were up 39 percent over last year. This is padded with petty offenders. There are more interesting figures that deserve comment.

The President's Crime Commission and others have identified the Cosa Nostra as the core of organized crime and estimated its membership at some 5,000. Since 1961 only about 130 identified Cosa Nostra members have been convicted by the Federal Government. That is a yearly conviction rate of less than half a percent.

Those 130 convictions in 7 years, incidentally, represent the efforts of 26 Federal investigative agencies, 94 U.S. attorney's offices and, of course, the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department.

Until that Department recognizes the need to utilize every legal weapon, the fight against organized crime will continue to be a losing battle.

Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of the Members to the fact that a special order has been obtained for later this afternoon to go into some detail with regard to the need for some fair and impartial type of wiretapping and electronic surveillance legislation in order to attack this very real and growing problem of organized crime.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 247]

Adair	Collier	Green, Oreg.
Andrews, Ala.	Corman	Griffiths
Aspinall	Daddario	Hansen, Idaho
Baring	Diggs	Hansen, Wash.
Bell	Dulski	Hébert
Brademas	Evins, Tenn.	Heckler, Mass.
Celler	Feighan	McCarthy
Clawson, Del.	Flood	McClory
Cohelan	Gallagher	McCulloch

McEwen	O'Hara, Mich.	Vander Jagt
McMillan	Pettis	Willis
May	Rivers	Wilson,
Miller, Calif.	Rumsfeld	Charles H.
Morton	St Germain	Wolff
Moss	Saylor	Wyatt
Multer	Sisk	
Murphy, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S APPEAL TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE TO HELP TACKLE THE PROBLEMS OF THE CITY IS ANSWERED BY AMERICA'S LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today marks an historic development in the partnership between business and Government in working together to tackle the complex urban problems confronting the Nation.

The White House has announced that the Nation's life insurance companies have pledged \$1 billion for investment in American cities to improve housing conditions and to finance job-creating enterprises.

These funds are to be made available as quickly as possible for projects which would not ordinarily be financed under normal business practices because of their location and risk.

As President Johnson noted today, what the Federal Government is doing for our cities—and it is a splendid record of achievement—is really only the beginning. He said:

Private efforts are not just essential to success—they are central to success.

The record will show that the Johnson administration has led the way toward encouraging private enterprise to share in the responsibility of building a better America.

Business concerns have performed admirably in administering Job Corps training programs in the poverty program. Many of our leading companies are deeply involved in advancing American education. And perhaps the best example of how fruitful is the partnership between Government and private enterprise can be found in our pioneering space program.

During the past 2 weeks, the administration initiated Project Turnkey to encourage private industry not only to develop and build new housing, but to manage such public housing projects in our cities.

There is no question but that business incentives and business efficiency can produce the kinds of results that we all hope to achieve in the American city.

But at the same time, I would remind my colleagues in the House that the Fed-

eral Government must do its share to meet its responsibilities to the American city dweller. And we must begin by restoring the President's full request for the rent supplement program. This program is really an effort to involve private enterprise in the work of solving urban problems. And we in Congress cannot turn our backs on this effort at a time when American business is beginning to respond in an unprecedented way.

Today, America's business community has demonstrated its confidence in the future of the American city. We in Congress must match this faith by a vote of confidence for rent supplements.

Mr. Speaker, I warmly congratulate the insurance companies of the United States who have taken a major step toward helping to solve a major problem in American society—the need to rebuild urban communities and plant new opportunities for those who have lived too long without hope and without help.

Private enterprise made America strong and great. Today, we have good reason to believe that American business will help to lead us forward to a new and better future.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967, AND AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 910 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 910

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Works now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my dis-

tinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and, pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a recommendation for an open rule calling for 3 hours of debate and waiver of points of order on S. 602, a bill to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and to amend title V of the Economic Development Act of 1965. Title I amends the Appalachian Act. Title II amends the EDA legislation with respect to other regional development programs.

The Rules Committee was impressed with the legislation fashioned by the Committee on Public Works.

I would like to pay tribute at this point to the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia which did the spadework on the bill and its very able chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. He has once again demonstrated the quality of his leadership in bringing an excellent piece of legislation to the floor.

There is a great concern these days about the troubles of our cities, about the increasing depth and complexity of the whole urban problem. Part of this problem, of course, is the seemingly endless influx of people from rural areas and small towns into metropolitan areas. This bill is aimed at providing opportunities—jobs—in Appalachia and with moving forward with plans for other regions. It is a choice between this and poverty. Perhaps more to the point it is a choice between this and the high cost of migration from the region of unequipped, impoverished people.

Title I of this bill is the second increment in a 6-year attack on the economic decline that has plagued the Appalachian region.

This program began, in one respect, as an experiment in government. It broke new ground in Federal-State relations that so far has given great promise.

In its other aspects, the program is unique because it consists of a regional approach to a regional problem. The very name "Appalachia" has come to imply underprivilege and want.

The program consists of highways, health facilities, land conservation, timber harvesting, restoration of land damaged by mining, an inventory of water resources, housing, vocational education, sewage treatment and antipollution and supplemental assistance in an array of other Federal programs. These are all designed for the peculiar terrain and economic characteristics of the Appalachian region.

The bill authorizes \$221.3 million for all nonhighway programs for the next 2 years and an additional \$175 million for highways for the next 4 years.

This program has already made inroads into the Appalachian problem. Highways, vocational schools, mine restoration, and public facilities have introduced hope into the region. This is a noteworthy beginning. It should be allowed to continue.

Title of this bill gives some more muscle to the five regional commissions established under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. These commissions, patterned after the Appalachian Commission, encompass all

or parts of New England, the Upper Great Lakes, the Ozarks, the Southeast Coastal Plains, and the four corners of the Far West.

The bill amends the law to direct \$2.5 million per year to each of the commissions for research, planning, demonstration projects, and administrative expenses. The money was authorized in the 1965 act, but the commissions have been slow to get underway. The amendment directs that the Secretary of Commerce, under whose jurisdiction the commissions fall, makes the funds available to them.

In addition, the bill authorizes \$5 million this fiscal year and \$10 million next fiscal year for each commission to use in supplemental assistance. The prototype for this program—helping localities take advantage of available Federal grants-in-aid—has been very successful in Appalachia and it should be helpful elsewhere.

I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain why the rule provides for a waiver of points of order on this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. The reason for the waiver is that section 112 (b), starting on page 43 of the bill and continuing on pages 44 and 45, involves a revolving fund of \$5 million, which could be considered to be in the nature of an appropriation. This revolving fund, called the Appalachian housing fund, has as its principal purpose the enabling of the Federal Government to pay up to 80 percent of the cost of planning and the cost of obtaining insured mortgages for housing projects.

Mr. GROSS. That is the sole reason for the waiver of points of order?

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. It is my understanding that is the sole reason, I will say to the distinguished gentleman, and I am sure also the gentleman has noted the rule does provide and make in order consideration of the substitute bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN].

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] has stated, House Resolution 910 provides for an open rule with 3 hours of general debate, waiving points of order, for the consideration of S. 602, the bill to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The rule provides for a waiver of points of order because on pages 44 to 45 of the bill a revolving fund is provided for which is in the nature of an appropriation of funds.

Title I of S. 602 contains the amendments to the Appalachian Regional Development Act and authorizes increased expenditures for the program. Authorized to be expended is \$936.7 million, of

which \$396.7 million represents new money. The remainder is a reauthorization of funds for the highway program now underway in the area.

Several new projects are added to the act, including a housing program similar to the low- and moderate-income program of section 221 of the Housing Act, and a new acid mine pollution control program.

I am happy that this bill contains an additional \$35 million for access highway construction. This will make it possible for the various States to build more access roads, which will serve a useful and needed purpose.

New counties are added to the region included in the Appalachian area, 24 in number, stretching from New York on the North to Mississippi in the South.

The act is amended to provide that all moneys appropriated will not become entangled in the cobwebs of the various executive departments.

Title II of the bill contains amendments to the Public Works and Economic Development Act. These amendments require that \$2.5 million be allocated for technical assistance and research for each regional development commission now in the creation stage. Second, supplemental grants are authorized in each regional development area similar to those available in Appalachia. For 1968, \$5 million is authorized for each area; for 1969, \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been a champion of the Appalachian regional program, and I know from personal experience how helpful the program has been to the people of my district. I strongly support it, and I want to see it continue as effectively as it has been in the past.

The Appalachian program is a good program, and this is a good bill. A fine beginning has been made in 2 years and the promise which this program holds for the future is real. In a relatively brief time, enormous progress has been made to construct a development highway system in the region, to develop health and education facilities, to deal with erosion, water resources, and other improvements, to unlock the enormous potential of this time-honored area of our country. This progress is substantial, but it is not enough. Much remains to be done, and this program certainly has proved itself as the way to do it.

What has been accomplished is fundamentally a tribute to the close cooperation of all levels of Government and people of different political persuasions in taking the limited assistance authorized by the Appalachian Act and making it work for the welfare of the Appalachian people. The Appalachian Regional Commission itself is the prime example of this cooperation between States and the Federal Government in making the decisions which are fundamental to the program. It is not a matter of a Federal bureaucrat or some department or bureau handing out orders. Within the Appalachian Commission there is an opportunity for the States to sit down, discuss their problems, discuss their needs, discuss their priorities, and to participate in the decisions on the expenditure of funds and the policies for their expenditure. This is healthy;

this is wholesome. More importantly, it works. And, putting responsibility on the States for the development of plans, programs, and projects—making them prove their cases—gives local people someone they can get hold of—the Governor.

It should be noted that the Appalachian Regional Commission, which has authority over the funds authorized by the Appalachian Act, and makes the key decisions on their expenditure, is a good institution partially because it is practically a nonpartisan institution. Four members of the Commission are Republicans—the Governors of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland. Their votes within the Commission are as potent as those of their Democrat colleagues. Their judgments on the expenditure of funds in their States hold as much sway as those of Democrat Governors.

There has been little hint of partisanship in the conduct of the Commission's affairs. The fact that the Republican Governors, whose States are participating in the program, have strongly urged its continuation is further testimony on this point.

I concur in the statement of my colleague from Tennessee that the benefits of this program go not just to the immediately affected region but beyond that to the country as a whole. If we are to begin to deal with the problems of the cities of which we are reminded daily by the press, by Members of Congress, and by events, we must find opportunities—jobs—outside the great metropolitan areas of the country.

Enormous migrations have taken place from the mountains of the Appalachian chain to the great metropolitan areas of the North and Northeast. This process has proceeded virtually unabated for 30 years and more. If it is not abated, solutions to our urban problems will become increasingly expensive and increasingly complex. Further, if Appalachia continues to impose a drain on the Nation's resources for welfare, for support and subsistence, the ultimate cost to the American taxpayer will be far greater than the immediate cost of a remedial effort such as authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

The program which it authorizes is hardnosed. Its focus is not on welfare or relief but on opportunity. It attacks the fundamental obstacles to economic growth in this region, the need for access, the need for better education, for health facilities, for erosion control, for exploitation of its water resources, and for dealing with the peculiar legacy of coal mining. Beyond these forms of assistance, the focus is on organizing all levels of government to do a better job with other Federal, State, and local programs and funds. The ultimate objective is to attract private capital, productive enterprise, and jobs which in the final analysis is the solution to the Appalachian problem.

A truly impressive start has been made to use the special assistance program authorized by this legislation. This beginning is the prolog to a new era for this region. It deserves further support of the Congress.

To capitalize on this start, I feel it would be wise and effective for us to approve the change in the appropriations procedure called for in this bill.

This House very seldom gets the opportunity to do anything more than talk at great length about States rights, State sovereignty and the slow erosion of the federal system. This is one of those rare occasions when we can do more than just talk about it.

The Appalachian program is State-oriented. It was conceived and born in and of the States. They are its essential components. Their rights and their prerogatives are given full sway.

If we authorize the appropriation of funds to the Commission as proposed, I think we are doing a lot more than just paying lip service to States rights. We are dignifying the whole concept of the Commission and thereby the whole idea of State responsibility. We are saying to the States that we believe you are fully capable of spending these funds prudently and carefully.

This approach is not a blank check. The guidelines and rules and regulations of each agency concerned must be fully adhered to. The expenditure of this money will be subjected to all the checks and balances all Federal funds are.

So I see little danger here in ending the confusion and diffusion of the present procedure. In fact, I see more than one plus. I see a better framework for the Congress to keep this program under scrutiny.

At the same time, we would be recognizing the effectiveness of essential management of the money for this program. Scatter-gun appropriations obviously lack the force of the single direct stroke in applying the money where it does the most good. We have already recognized the effectiveness of an association of States into a single commission for the purposes of this program. Why should we not extend the same recognition to the coordination of funding?

I would urge sanction of this method of financing if only as an experiment. After all, the Appalachian program itself is an experiment and if we can do anything to help guarantee its success, I believe it is incumbent on us to do so.

I take this opportunity to call to the attention of all Members and urge that they read the minority views contained in the report on S. 602, starting on page 72 and ending on page 85. There are also supplemental and additional views, which might be of interest and which follow the minority views in the same report, and I, likewise, call these to your attention.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rule be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker,

I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 602 to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], and the Chair requests that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] temporarily assume the chair.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 602, with Mr. BOLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 1½ hours. The Chair recognizes now the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, he called it the "truest example of creative federalism in our time." The bill had run the gauntlet of hearings in the House and the Senate in both the 88th and 89th Congresses. Behind the bill lay a solid year of work by a Presidential Commission broadly representative of the States, various Federal agencies, and other interests concerned with the well-being of the Appalachian region. In spite of that long history, however, we could not know how prophetic the President was. This program has truly harnessed Federal, State, and local governments to use the funds and the time allotted to them in the best interests of the people of the Appalachian region.

The bill before the House today would extend the Appalachian program for an additional 2 years, make minor amendments in it, and, based on its experience, authorize limited funds for other regional development programs.

The Committee on Public Works is proud to report this legislation to the House. This is a good bill. The committee and the House are indebted to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] for his outstanding work as chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia. That this program has been successful is due in no small measure to the time and efforts expended on it by that subcommittee and the full Committee on Public Works in 1965.

There is no need for me to recount the reasons the Appalachian program

was enacted. The plight of this region and its people have been recounted and analyzed many times over the national press and in testimony before committees of the Congress. Because of recent developments in the country, however, I think it should be noted by Members of this body that the national interest is involved in this bill and in this program. It is currently appropriate to recount and to dwell on the problems of the cities and to suggest elaborate and extremely expensive cures for those ailments. What we have in the Appalachian program is some preventive medicine, for without an intensive and creative development effort for this region, out migration will continue. And that means out migration to the great metropolitan areas of this country where the costs of economic dislocation grow higher and higher with each passing year.

The cost of this medicine is small. In my judgment, this is one of the best investments in the future of the country authorized by the legislation before this body today.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Works has today brought to the floor of the House for its consideration the bill S. 602, to revise and extend the Appalachian Act of 1965 and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 with respect to regional development programs, fostered under title V of that program.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the steadfastness of the members of the special subcommittee, along with the members of the full committee, for giving complete and very deliberate study to all of the problems involved in this program.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that it is significant that during the course of several months we have received a wide group of people and have heard from them, representing every interest and from every local government, and not a single witness appeared before the committee to protest the aims and the aspirations contained in the legislation.

Gov. Hulett Smith, the cochairman with the States' other chairmen, appeared to represent the States. The Governors and their representatives testified at great length as to the value and the importance of this legislation in developing a meaningful program that would give relief and assistance to depressed areas of our country. This bill is the second installment of the program.

Back in 1965 we passed the previous development highway section of the bill which would last until 1971. The other programs, of which there are a variety, we felt it would be necessary for us to make reasonable examinations as to how they were being received, how they were being administered, and the results they were obtaining in their administration. So it is for that reason that we are extending the other programs in making additions to the development highway section, brought about by the addition of the State of New York, which I will go into a little bit later.

I believe it is also worthwhile that we discuss the historical background and de-

velopment of this program. In 1960 the Governors of the affected States met in a conference to examine what could be done in a concerted fashion to have programs that would be helpful to these underprivileged areas that were not showing economic growth, that were faced with health problems, and where educational qualities were deteriorating. They came out with the response that they needed a coordinated program along with the Federal Government.

President Kennedy appointed a commission that worked with the Governors. As the result of those consultations a proposal was made which was submitted by President Johnson and was later drafted in the bill that we have had under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the Appalachian area of our country is central to the history of our Nation. Its hardwoods built most of the great cities of our Nation. Its coal fired the furnaces and provided the power to build our economy. Its waterways were the avenues of commerce which marked the early history of this Nation. But too much of the coal was mined without adequate care, too much of the timber was cut without proper conservation, and too many rivers were polluted with industrial waste, mine acids, and other foreign matter.

The small subsistence farms which were the early base of American economy and society were going, and going very rapidly, even more rapidly in Appalachia than elsewhere in the country because the limited terrain and the topography did not lend itself to an expansion of large land areas. These factors created all the problems we are dealing with now. A new economy had to be built. We had to have new enterprises, new jobs.

So it was that the Appalachian Regional Development Act took into account some of the major aspects of the problem. This is centered on transportation in providing funds for a system of major highways throughout the region complementary to the interstate routes, and to provide new access for commerce, and to gain access into the region.

You will recall that the major portion of this program of \$840 million was set aside for highway and access road development, because it was felt that transportation was the most wanted need in the entire area.

We had to make better use of our regions of water resources through the development of a comprehensive plan for the region.

We had to have better use of the land in the region by land damaging and mining and through treatments of other land which are Federal cost sharing.

We had to have better health facilities.

We had to have better educational institutions, and particularly vocational education.

We had to have sewer treatment plants, and through a program of supplemental grants in aid, to make better use of Federal programs which had not been fully effective in these areas.

We had to have better organization through the creation of a joint Federal-State commission to administer the pro-

gram and place primary responsibility for a concerted development effort upon the State governing bodies.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act created a commission proposed by the Governors of the Appalachian States and the representatives of the Federal Government who serve as cochairmen with one of the Governors.

This has been a very fine arrangement. It has worked well. I am told there has not been a dissenting vote in any of the meetings of the commission on the aims and programs that have been discussed in the Governors' conference or with the conference of the Governors' representatives.

Now, because of the leadtime needed for planning and right-of-way acquisition, the highway program, as I have just stated was for a 6-year period is just getting started. It is expected to utilize some 2,350 miles of development highways and approximately 1,000 miles of access roads.

Other programs such as health, land stabilization, timber, mining, water resources were included in the 2-year program.

All of this is designed to achieve one objective: the economic betterment of a perpetually underprivileged part of America.

It was recognized that this could not be accomplished, that the region could not become self-sustaining, simply through a random application of Federal grants-in-aid programs of funds.

The Congress even laid this down as a mandate by declaring in the findings and the statement of the purpose of the act of 1965:

The public investments made in the region under this act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this Appalachian program is a means to an end rather than an end itself. The ultimate solution lies in the investment of private capital in the region and, perhaps more importantly, the retention of its own capital wealth through reinvestment.

This has been a unique program, Mr. Chairman, because the States have provided the initiative in deciding their own needs and priorities within the framework of the Appalachian Commission and then worked with the Federal Government to meet their goal. It was the Governors who approached the Federal Government for assistance, and the States have an equal voice in making the decision in carrying out the program.

It is also unique that the States have not uniformly adopted the same program, because the necessities of one State may not fit the requirements or the immediate needs of other States. Consequently, there has been a diverse use of employment of the Federal programs that went into play in developing this total program.

The Appalachian Act of 1965 authorized \$840 million for development highways and access roads and \$252.4 mil-

lion for all other programs. The committee bill, in effect, reauthorizes the amount and adds an additional \$175 million to the highway program to provide \$140 million for the highway corridors that are to be constructed in the States of Pennsylvania and New York, and \$35 million for access roads over and above that heretofore authorized. So we have an additional amount in the bill for highways of \$175 million.

There was not any insistence that mileage be increased. There was not any insistence that the Commission would come back and re-petition for an enlargement of the program. But so far the program has advanced to where the construction is underway. Other highways are being planned and programmed.

When we were considering the act of 1965, I said:

In the past, most Appalachians have earned their income from three major activities—coal mining, lumbering, and farming. Each of these occupations has declined over the past quarter of a century. Each has declined nationally, but the effects in Appalachia have been particularly severe. That means that new skills must be provided and for that reason we have included in this bill a program that will accelerate the construction of vocational education facilities in Appalachia.

That acceleration has taken place. Seventy vocational schools have been initiated. Fifteen thousand students will attend class this fall in vocational education schools that have been stimulated by this program. Schools now under construction will accommodate another 18,000 students. Funds expended for this purpose are essential to insure that 10 or 20 years from now this body will not be called upon to consider an Appalachia problem. Because of this impressive activity which has been undertaken to provide vocational education—skills and jobs—and because of what can be accomplished in the next 2 years, the committee increased the funds authorized for this purpose by \$8 million over the Senate bill. The bill authorizes \$26 million for 50-percent matching grants for vocational education through fiscal year 1969.

This is the only increase that was made by the House committee. Virtually all funds authorized and appropriated for the land stabilization, mine area restoration programs have been committed to capitalize on the land available for development in the region, and we are providing for a continuation of this program.

Water resource surveys have been on schedule, and the bill carries \$2 million additional for that purpose.

The philosophy in the 1965 act was not only to provide extra financial assistance to the Appalachian region, but also to make better use of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs in which the Appalachian area had not participated to a full extent because of a lack of matching funds and the know-how to make these programs work.

The evidence presented to the committee established quite clearly that the Appalachian program is meeting these needs. Federal grants-in-aid to the pro-

grams eligible for supplementary grants have almost doubled from \$65 million in 1965 to \$131 million in 1967. Rarely does this House get such clear evidence that a program is doing what it is supposed to do.

The other section of the bill is the recognition of the critical needs in housing. It amends the Appalachian Redevelopment Act to produce better use of section 221 of the National Housing Act relating to low- and moderate-income housing, through loans to underwrite the costs of planning projects, obtaining insured mortgages, and related activities in Appalachia.

Testimony further shows that of all the areas in Appalachia, only Pittsburgh, Pa., and Birmingham, Ala., have utilized this program.

The bill also adds 20 additional counties in Mississippi, which is a contiguous area which has the economic dislocations that are characteristic of the area. It also adds two additional counties in Alabama, one in the State of Tennessee, and one additional county in New York. The committee felt justified in including these additional counties because of their relationship to the Appalachia area.

Now, with respect to title II of the bill. That title amends the Public Works and Economic Development Act to earmark funds for research, planning, demonstration projects, and administrative expenses for regional development commissions organized under that act. It also authorizes funds for supplementary grants similar to those that were included in the Appalachian Act. These provisions were added by the Senate because these programs had been proven in Appalachia, and it was the expectation in enacting the Economic Development Act of 1965 that those five commissions would pursue the same effort that the Governors made in Appalachia, and collect all the genius of their people, and their knowledge and information, and work out their own program.

Five regional commissions have been organized under the Economic Development Act. They are as follows: the Ozark, which includes parts of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma; the Upper Great Lakes, including parts of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; New England, including Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont; the Coastal Plains, including the coastal areas of Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina; and the Four Corners Region, including parts of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Utah. There is demonstrated need in these areas and demonstrated capabilities of the people to put together a useful program that will inure not only to the benefit and profit of these areas, but will have a wholesome and welcome effect upon the economy of the entire United States.

I apologize to the Committee for having taken so long, but I felt there was need to review before the Committee the basis of the act and the experience in its administration and experience in programming.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

How many States presently are involved in this thing known as Appalachia?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Twelve States.

Mr. GROSS. Twelve States. It has not reached out to California yet, has it?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No.

Mr. GROSS. But it has gotten into Alabama, Mississippi, and New York?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the act of 1965, the State of New York had the license to come in. It did not at that time, because their program schedule was not sufficiently advanced to permit them to come in.

The State of Mississippi, on the other hand, felt it would rather wait to see the effect of the program in other States before being admitted.

At the Governors' conference on admissions, in the deliberations, there was not a single vote by any State to deny them the admission of those counties.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for a great amount of work on a most important piece of legislation.

Since I come from the heart of the Appalachian area, I am concerned about the main artery highways. If I understood this correctly, up until July 1, 1966, the Federal Government paid not only 70 percent for advance engineering, design, and acquisition of highway rights-of-way, but also 70 percent for the actual construction of four lanes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not for four-lane highways. That was for access roads of two lanes. The amount made available for four lanes has been 50 percent.

Mr. PERKINS. Since July 1, 1966, it has been 50 percent. For the main artery highways today it is the policy to pay 70 percent for the acquisition of rights-of-way and advance engineering, but only 50 percent for construction. If the States want to go ahead with a four-laning of main artery highways the State has to pay 50 percent of the construction; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. But that is only a policy of the Bureau of Public Roads, and there is nothing in this bill to prevent the Federal Government from paying 70 percent of the actual construction on four lanes today; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As I understand the gentleman's question, it is: Can they pay up to 70 percent? They can pay up to 70 percent, but have not engaged in paying up to 70 percent on four-lane highways.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no limitation to prevent them from paying 70 percent,

if the Federal Government so desires, on main artery four-lane highways?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I approach this Appalachian legislation with conflicting feelings. I am, of course, heartily in favor of it. Yet, I am gravely disappointed that the amounts of money are so much smaller than the sums I feel are necessary to accomplish the job we have set out to do: to improve the economic status of the people who live in the mountain areas of the eastern United States.

My viewpoint is a bit different from that of many Members of the House.

First, because I am from this Appalachian mountain area, I know the need; I know the deprivation that exists in my part of the country. I also know that while this program does not have all the answers, it is certainly on the right track and holds the best promise of something better.

Second, as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I sit in on the authorizing of billions of dollars for education and welfare—the program to end poverty, to help schools, and to provide other programs. I know something of the needs of the people.

But the Appalachian program is different from the welfare programs. It is intended to build an economic base by providing highways, sewer systems, airports, industrial parks, hospitals—all the elements which would make it possible for this mountain region to attract to it the industry which would provide jobs for a population which, with the proper training, would supply a pool of intelligent and capable workers.

Among all the many worthwhile features of the Appalachian program, I feel that the one which would benefit the region the most is the one which would make our cities and town and creek hollows accessible to the rest of the world. I mean the program under which the Appalachian Commission is helping State highway departments pay for the construction of highways in the mountain area where such construction is far more expensive than in the flatlands of so much of our Nation.

It is here that I feel my greatest disappointment with the measure before us. What we need to open the Appalachian region to the rest of the world is the construction of four-lane highways. Yet, the amounts contained in the bill for roadbuilding have been so reduced that it will be a great temptation for State highway departments to be content with two-lane main artery roads.

I know that the Committee on Public Works has done the best it could with this measure. My own ideas of what should be authorized are far above the amounts the President put in his budget. I wish the committee had not reduced the sums requested by the President.

I most earnestly urge the House not to go below the figures arrived at by the Public Works Committee. It is greatly important that the Appalachian program, which has been in existence 2 years, not lose any of the momentum it has acquired during its brief life.

I am especially pleased that the com-

mittee has increased the authorization for vocational education from the sum of \$18 million to \$26 million. Roadbuilding, industrial development, greater access to the outside world will call more and more for the skills the vocational schools of Appalachia can impart to our people.

I urge vigorously that this bill be approved.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 248]

Adair	Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashley	Flood	O'Hara, Mich.
Aspinall	Gallagher	Pirnie
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Rivers
Bell	Hanna	Rumsfeld
Berry	Hansen, Idaho	St Germain
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.	Saylor
Brademas	Hébert	Sikes
Brown, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Steed
Celler	Hicks	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del.	Holland	Ullman
Cohelan	Leggett	Vander Jagt
Collier	McCarthy	Willis
Corman	McCulloch	Wilson
Daddario	McMillan	Charles H.
Dingell	May	Wolff
Dorn	Miller, Calif.	Wyatt
Evins, Tenn.	Moss	
Felghan	Multer	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 602, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 376 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill known as the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967, which in effect is a potpourri of public works, a warmed-over, accelerated public works program, Area Redevelopment Administration reincarnated, all of those programs having proved to be an abject failure. So we are trying again to do something about poverty through public works, from which we never get a full dollar's worth of value for each dollar spent.

This is a program for which we have already appropriated in previous years approximately \$300 million for development highway and access roads, and \$166.9 million for other Appalachian programs, a total of nearly a half billion dollars.

Secondly, we are asking in this legislation, or the committee is, for new authorizations for Appalachia of \$396 million. This together with existing unappropriated authorizations for development highways and access roads of \$540 million, totals \$936.7 million. The Congress previously appropriated \$466.99 million,

so the total previous appropriations, plus future authorizations, including this bill is \$1.4 billion—and this is for 4 years of a 6-year general program and 6 years of the highway program, so there are 2 more years to go at least on the general program. To make sure all these other EDA areas get in on some of the Appalachian goodies, there is \$75 million more for those EDA areas.

Of course, that is the move. That is what is coming. All of these EDA areas are involved. They have already announced some five of them regional commissions, and there are two more under consideration, and there is a third they are talking about in the gulf coast area. They are all going to get these special potpourri programs.

So this Appalachia is the pattern for endless public works, for accelerated public works programs. I believe we should realize that.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman when I have finished my remarks.

Mr. HAYS. I should like for the gentleman to yield briefly, on the subject of EDA. That is only thrown in to dredge up enough votes to pass the parent bill.

Let me say that I have six counties in Appalachia, and it is the greatest boondoggle which ever came down the road.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman, I am delighted I yielded. The gentleman always makes a valuable contribution, and particularly so in this instance.

That was the next subject I was to get to. That was a mighty fine preface.

One of the previous speakers said that President Johnson suggested this was the beginning of creative federalism.

The gentleman suggests, and I suggest, it is one of the best examples or the perfect example of creative favoritism. As a matter of fact, there is going to be a discussion by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] as to whether or not it is constitutional to provide such favoritism to Appalachia, to the exclusion of the rest of America.

The gentleman is eminently correct. EDA has been thrown in to attract votes.

Members will notice that the principal speaker had to list every State which is going to get special treatment under this EDA title II, to make sure that those who come from those States vote for this thing, not because they are in Appalachia but because they are going to get a little something, perhaps, out of title II, in EDA, which should not be in this bill in the first place.

This is supposed to be the Appalachia bill. It is clear that many Members of the House believe, as I do, that this is basically discriminatory legislation, discriminating against the rest of the Nation. If it is good for Appalachia, why should it not be good for the rest of the Nation?

It is quite obvious. There is no evidence that this total package of potpourri accelerated public works is doing the job or will do the job on a permanent basis.

ARA did not do it. APW did not do it. This is warmed over failure.

Why, they are talking about demonstration health facilities, land stabilization, timber development, mining restoration, water resources surveys, a new housing program, vocational education, sewage treatment, supplemental grants across the broad spectrum of Federal aid, with programs up to 80 percent of the cost thereof, local development district assistance, and highways.

Highways, incidentally, are very interesting. When this bill was presented to us a few years ago I was under the impression that this was going to open up new areas, that this was going to take the mountain region of Appalachia and permit the development of highways and opening up these distant areas, separated from the rest of the country by these craggy mountains and these valleys, areas which are inaccessible, and this was going to open up the great region for development.

What happened? Here is what they have done. They have decided they want to build arterial highways, not new ones. They want to reconstruct and improve presently existing highways which they say are not built to a high enough standard.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. In view of the gentleman's contribution a while ago, I yield briefly.

Mr. HAYS. I wonder if the gentleman can enlighten me about what a developmental highway is. In my State they are retreading U.S. Route 50 to Cincinnati. I did not know Cincinnati was in Appalachia, but that is what they are doing with all the money.

As the gentleman says, the whole original concept of access highways has been lost. They are just rebuilding already existing highways, with an awful lot of money.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is eminently correct. That is the point I was attempting to make.

Here is the map of what they are building. The idea is they want to have connecting arterial highways. This is in addition to the primary system, to the secondary system, and to the urban highways already approved for Federal participation. This is in addition to the interstate highway system.

Boy, if anybody got a bonus out of the Interstate Highway System it was West Virginia, shortly after the election in 1960. Prior to the election, interstate mileage in West Virginia totaled 385 miles. Out of the 528 miles left undesignated, they got an additional 125 miles, yet they have to have more highways, arterial highways, through the State of West Virginia and other States.

So what they are doing is retreading, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] says, the present highways and building them up to higher standards. I am not debating this. I want to say in all fairness that there is an access road program, which is possibly what the gentleman from Oklahoma wants to say. I will yield to him in just 1 minute. However, how much of the \$1.015 billion are we putting into access highways for opening up new areas? It is \$35 million. That is

generous, is it not? They are asking us for \$35 million more in this bill. That is what they want for opening up new areas.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I know what a campaign he had on States rights. I am sure he is aware that the decisions within the States on what the priority needs are in Appalachia are being made by the highest elected officer in the State almost without exception, that is, by the Governor of the State or his duly constituted highway authority. So the gentleman apparently is not satisfied with a State determination as to what the highest priority need is for highway development within the Appalachia region.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that there were certain guidelines suggested by the executive branch of the Government and the Bureau of Public Roads, which they naturally took into consideration. Secondly, there was a study made by a regional commission prior to that time, and they made certain suggestions. I do believe that whether it is Federal or State officials, if you are going to open up new areas, I believe you should spend money for that and not for retreading old roads.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The guideline in my State was very clear. It was, let us build highways to where the most votes are. To hell with Appalachia. We do not care about access roads to those hill counties, because there are only a few people down there, maybe 16,000 or 20,000 people. Let us build a road to Cincinnati, because there are 500,000 or 600,000 people there and maybe more.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman from Ohio expressed it far more colorfully than I dare to on the floor of the House.

So, what does this bill do? The bill provides basically for substantial additional funds. We can expect at least \$2 billion more. We can expect when it is over with that the problems are not going to be solved, either. That is what bothers me. If I thought this would solve the problems of Appalachia over a 6-year period, that would be something else. Now, do not tell me they are not going to have to do it again, if you are going to do the job, because there will be another \$2 billion here for another 6 years. If I thought it would do the job and help these poverty-stricken people, and if we had the evidence that they were getting the help any more than they are under the Office of Economic Opportunity, then that would be different. If I thought they were the ones who were going to benefit by this, then that would be different. The facilities that are going to be built are going to be built in the big city areas rather than the poverty areas. If they were not then I would be much more inclined to support the legislation even though it will be discriminatory. But in

my opinion, if it is not going to do the job, it is discriminatory by itself.

What are they doing in this bill? This will not do the job. Is it capable of doing the job? No. It is just a mustard plaster on an area which is supposedly suffering from the cancer of underdevelopment. It is just in the inherent nature of the area. They are saying that it is not doing so well so far, so we had better expand it. Let us get a lot of \$2 billion programs into this Appalachia region and apply some of these mustard plasters on top of others. Let us inject some new elements in this. Let us mix up a potpourri of public works, and maybe this will help some. Of course, at the same time they are saying that we had better change the man who is at the head of the program. Do you know who is going to head the program up under this bill? It is a man who has all kinds of time to do it. He only has to deal now with Vietnam, with the budget, with taxes, and with everything else. He is the President of the United States. He is going to be in charge of this program under this new suggested bill that is before us. He is going to be the one who will control the money and decide which agencies get it and how much.

Of course, he can do it to some extent anyway. But we direct in this bill that he is the man to whom the money is going. We are putting all of it into the hands of the President. The bureaucratic maze, that we will have to go through in order to get decisions will be intolerable, as compared to decisions under the present law.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CRAMER. I really did not expect to take this much time, but if the gentleman is interested in propounding a question, I shall be glad to listen.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. I want to make a very short statement to the effect that if you are given an opportunity to vote for an amendment to aid the cities, and if the gentleman is so concerned about them, I do hope the gentleman will support my amendment when it is offered.

Mr. CRAMER. I do not recall making that statement. The gentleman knows full well that I oppose such an amendment.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, then the gentleman belies his own statement?

Mr. CRAMER. Well, I do not think the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] quite understood what I was saying. What I was saying is that the money goes to the President. I do not know what that has to do with the problems of the cities.

Mr. Chairman, what else will they do? They are amending this bill and are adding to it 24 new counties, new counties that are not located in the mountain land areas, as well as 17 other counties in an area unrelated to this problem. They do not represent regional development problems. That is what has been stated that is going to be done, added to a part of the mountainous regions or to a part of our mountain lands.

But, lo and behold, this may be another matter or indication or location

where we may need to get a few more votes and therefore, we have got to bring into the coverage of this program 24 more counties; we have got to add a few in New York, we have got to add a few here and there, we have got to bring in some Mississippi counties, because of an oversight or otherwise we left them out, a substantial number of counties.

And, Mr. Chairman, what else have we got to do? We have got to expand the program by authorizing funds in excess of the amounts that have been appropriated in the past for any given fiscal year.

This year the President asked for fiscal 1968 approximately \$64 million. And, what is being asked for in this bill? The \$220 million is being requested for a period of 2 years, for 1968 and 1969. The amount which will be left over for fiscal year 1969 represents an amount about 2½ times the amount which was asked for in fiscal year 1968.

How does one possibly justify that request?

Of course, I will admit that there is a \$42 million carryover of appropriated funds but if you add that to approximately \$64 million budget request for 1968, there will be approximately \$106 million total available for expenditure in 1968. If \$220 million is authorized for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, some \$156 million will be available for appropriation in 1969.

Mr. Chairman, we know that we have on our hands a war. And, based upon the best authority in the House of Representatives, the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], unless we pass a surtax this year, we will have a \$28 billion deficit. It is my opinion that our consideration of the legislation dealing with Appalachia must be considered in view of the deficit with which we are confronted and based upon the amount of money which we can reasonably and logically expend.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, an amendment will be offered to cut the amount which has been requested to a reasonable amount, the amount which was requested for fiscal year 1968 plus unexpended funds carried over from 1967, and to provide for the same amount for fiscal year 1969.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. So, Mr. Chairman, what they are proposing for fiscal year 1969, which starts during the period of the Presidential election, which will be held in November 1968, is that the President should have under his control, and not under the control of the various departments and agencies, \$156 million, about 2½ times what he is asking for this year for accelerated public works in the area of Appalachia.

Mr. Chairman, we do not like that arrangement. We think it is unreasonable. We think that the departments and agencies that have been administering

the program should be considered and that the program ought to continue to operate as it has in the past and that the Congress should handle and approve the authorization. Also, we think that the amount which is being requested in this legislation is unreasonable.

Mr. Chairman, what else has been done in this legislation? They have proposed the expansion of a number of programs. Secondly, they have added new programs. And, if you want to read the bill and what it contains with reference to new programs—and this program, incidentally, came out of the Committee on Public Works, you will find a housing program. It did not come out of the Committee on Banking and Currency—we on the Committee on Public Works now are authorities on housing and real estate, all of a sudden.

According to this language, which is contained on page 43 of the bill, section 207, we are going into assistance for planning and other preliminary matters with reference to proposed housing projects under the National Housing Act.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we are going to do is to provide for the making of loans not to exceed 80 percent to private enterprise or public associations, for the purpose of making preliminary surveys, analyses of market needs, as well as preliminary site engineering and architectural fees as well as even site options.

The cost of site options will be money loaned for that purpose. This is a matter that should be considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, not by the Committee on Public Works. An effort will be made to strike it out until the committee that should properly consider it looks into the problem.

I have discussed briefly the money involved here, and I will deal with that to a greater degree when the debate period commences.

Now we are moving into EDA, which has no business being in this whatsoever. That is not only my word; that is the same thing the manager on the part of the other body said on the floor of the other body when it was up for consideration, we have no business going into an EDA matter in an Appalachian bill. What did he say? He said:

It is impossible for me, however—

And this is the manager on the Senate side, and this appears at page 84 in the minority views—

It is impossible for me, however, to accept an amendment for the authorization of substantial sums of money for programs which have not been given adequate hearing.

The administration did not ask for title II. The administration did not ask for it. The gentleman from Ohio put his finger on it when he said that in order to get enough votes for Appalachia they threw it in. They knew they were in trouble on Appalachia, because it relates to this authorization, so they threw in EDA. It has no business being in there.

The floor manager on the Senate side said:

However, the money that is in there is just seed money.

And have we not seen these seeds grow into big, fat, spending trees before? That

is exactly what is going to happen here. The \$75 million will be \$500 million.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. They are reaching out and touching everybody, in Ohio they give every school in Appalachia, every school some money, about 50 cents a student.

Mr. CRAMER. I believe that is further evidence that this program is not going to do the job, because it does not get down to the person in need. This is obvious. I am confident this is not going to be the answer. If I thought it would be the answer, if I thought it would do the job in Appalachia, that would be one thing, but it will not do it.

But I recognize the realities of life, and this bill very probably will pass. It probably will, because it is part of an ongoing program, therefore the only alternative left will be to work toward trying to make a decent bill out of it. So we will in good conscience, in carrying out our responsibilities, offer an amendment. We offered some 29 amendments in the committee itself, and some 15 were passed, and I thank the majority for giving reasonable consideration to those amendments.

There are others remaining that should be considered. We hope to eliminate the housing title section. We hope we can come out with a dollar figure of a reasonable amount. We hope we can take EDA out of this. It does not belong in here whatsoever in the first place. We hope we can leave the spending authority where it belongs, in the agencies that administer the specific programs. I hope the Members will give serious consideration and attention to those amendments that are intended to make a better program out of this.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It appears that the work of the Appalachian Regional Commission represents about the only exception among the new programs initiated by this administration which has not created more problems than it has helped to solve. I give my support to this legislation with cautious optimism, but hasten to indicate that any reluctance comes from what I believe to be an inadequate consideration of the achievements of the past 2 years and potential problems that may or may not exist. On the surface it appears that the implementation of this act has resulted in accomplishments without charges of mismanagement, political interference, or the many other charges so prevalent in other programs. The surface should be scratched to be certain.

There are several things about the proposed amendments incorporated in the House version of S. 602 which do concern me and which I would like to see cleared up.

This legislation was originally intended to expedite the economic development of the Appalachian region which I believe to be those counties in the Appalachian

Mountain area which share the similar characteristics of rugged terrain and some degree of isolation by virtue of the terrain. In 1965 the Senate added 13 new counties in New York and the Senate in the current bill has added 18 counties in the State of Mississippi, two additional counties in Alabama, and one additional county in New York to which the House Committee on Public Works has agreed. In addition, the House Committee on Public Works has added three additional counties. The House should delete any of these new counties which are not in the Appalachian Mountain Range, because it merely tends to dilute the appropriation that will be made and thereby deprive existing bona fide counties of funds that would otherwise be allotted to them.

I believe I am correct in my understanding that, with one or two exceptions, these new counties do not fall within the general understanding of what we consider mountain country. If the Congress continues to increase the area covered by this program, it will lose its significance to the area it was designed to help. I am not impressed with the argument that this legislation is "favoritism." Admittedly, it is—so is agriculture legislation to the rural areas of agriculture abundance that it helps—so is urban renewal to the cities and much other legislation that is enacted.

The supplementary views of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], as they appear in the Senate's report on S. 602, are very compelling to me.

It is essential that the House support the committee's action in deleting from the Senate bill "the cultural programs" since this act is designed to improve the economic standards of the area affected rather than the esthetics of the area. In addition, the House should give consideration to the deletion of the title "Assistance for Planning and Other Preliminary Expenses of Proposed Housing Projects Under Section 221 of the National Housing Act," as the Farmers Home Administration and the Federal Housing Administration have been handling the situation in the Appalachian region without any serious problems and adequately enough.

As I indicated earlier, this program is about the only one which has not found itself embroiled in conflicts and disputes over jurisdiction with other agencies; this housing section could well be the end of the honeymoon in that respect.

As the Members know, this act will cease to be in effect on July 1, 1971, and its 2 years of life thus far indicate that it may well accomplish the purpose for which it was designed if it can be kept within the concept of the original act.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Celler	Gathings	O'Hara, Mich.
Clawson, Del.	Green, Oreg.	Pirnie
Cohelan	Hansen, Idaho	Pool
Collier	Hansen, Wash.	Rivers
Corman	Hébert	Rumsfeld
Cowger	Herlong	St Germain
Daddario	Holland	Saylor
Dent	Irwin	Sikes
Dickinson	Kleppe	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McCarthy	Ullman
Evins, Tenn.	McCulloch	Vander Jagt
Feighan	McMillan	Willis
Flood	May	Wilson,
Flynt	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
Fraser	Multer	Wolff
Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyatt

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 602, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 378 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished member of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, as one who has enjoyed through the years debating now and then with my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, on various pieces of legislation, I enjoyed particular pleasure in hearing several of the gentleman's remarks in his preliminary argument today in connection with the consideration of this legislation.

In the first place, it was a real pleasure to learn from the gentleman from this well that the minority really does not expect to defeat this bill; that all they are undertaking to do in the offering of amendments—and they do have in mind the offering of a considerable number of amendments. I cannot help but think immediately when I hear this statement of the famous old story about the fisherman who upon having caught an old catfish, said, "Hold still, little catfish; I am not going to hurt you; I am just going to cut your guts out."

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Florida has something like that "catfish operation" in mind when he says they are going to offer constructive amendments to the bill on the floor today.

The fact of the matter is that the Committee on Public Works in working upon this particular piece of legislation, has already accepted and agreed to approximately 20 amendments that were offered by the gentleman from Florida and by his distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENDEL], as well as various other members of the minority.

As a matter of fact, we adopted so many amendments offered by the minority while we were marking up this bill that I got to believing we were going to have to call it the Jones-Cramer-Schwengel bill before we got through marking it up to bring it to the floor of the House. Because what we did in committee, I say to my friends in this House, was to take the cream of the amend-

ments that were offered by the other side, and I believe they did improve the bill in some particulars, and I believe we owe a debt of gratitude to our friends on the minority side for some of the amendments that were offered in committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Does the gentleman say that those were gutting amendments? I would hope the gentleman would take another look at the ones we expect to offer, because they are not really gutting amendments, except on title II, and we would like to kill that fish entirely.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to say to the gentleman that when he speaks about deleting entirely title II, the gentleman is certainly in the position of gutting that section, and that is what it means to me and to the people throughout the country.

Mr. CRAMER. We will take the whole fish on that one, we will defeat it entirely.

Mr. EDMONDSON. After we had adopted these 20-some odd amendments, some of them helpful amendments, we then faced a situation in which even with all these amendments, even with a reduction of more than \$50 million below the Senate figure, our good friends on the other side still were not satisfied with the product. As a matter of fact, I understand that some of them are circulating amendments here today that were not even offered in the committee when we considered this bill, and are asking us to give consideration on the floor to those amendments.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment that will clean this bill up real good; I propose to offer an amendment striking out the enacting clause.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman I believe has made his feelings about this bill fairly clear already. I understand his feelings about it. I regret the gentleman, who is always constructive and always informed on any subject, could not find the time to come to the Committee on Public Works when we were considering this bill over a period of days when there were a series of hearings held on it, so that we might have the ideas and suggestions the gentleman has to offer about improving it. But I know the gentleman is a busy man, and I know he was in attendance those days on the floor of the House when we were meeting into the afternoon in trying to get this bill out.

Mr. Chairman, the second remark of the gentleman from Florida that I particularly appreciated was what I understood to be his major argument against title II.

If I heard the gentleman correctly and understood him correctly, the principal argument he has against title II, which provides the grant-in-aid money for these other regional commissions, is that the administration did not ask for it. That is the principal argument

[Roll No. 249]

Adair	Aspinall	Bell
Ashley	Baring	Brademas

made by the gentleman from Florida, that the administration did not even ask for this.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if any of my friends on this side of the House last fall heard the attacks over and over again which were leveled at those of us on the Democratic side of this House, that we were rubberstamps, and we were rubberstamps because we were voting for the things the administration had asked for. The things we had acted upon and voted for, that were asked for by the administration, drew fire all over this country from those on the other side of the aisle.

Now we come before this House with a piece of legislation on which we have exercised legislative initiative, on which we have recognized a need for these five new regional commissions for grant-in-aid money, or for specific authorization of administrative money or technical assistance and planning money, and the big argument on the other side is "Well, the administration did not even ask for it."

Am I to assume from that, Mr. Chairman, that the rubberstamps in the House today are my friends on the other side of the aisle, my Republican friends, who are not going to go along with this because the administration did not ask for it?

Am I to assume that if the administration does not ask for something that my friends on the other side are going to vote against it, that they are going to be the rubberstamps in this Congress insofar as requests by the administration are concerned?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. We do not say that President Johnson is wrong all the time. We just say that he is wrong most of the time. In this instance he is right and I compliment him for not unbalancing the budget further by asking for these programs. I do not want to impose upon the indulgence of the House by taking up too much time, but there are stated and elucidated five or six reasons in the minority views as to why title II should not be in here. I call attention to page 83 of the report. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think if anybody wanted to explore the minority views and turn to the minority report, they can find about 15 different versions of what the minority thinks about this. There are about as many versions of the minority views as there are minority members of the committee—and some of them signed two or three different versions.

It all adds up to the fact in my personal judgment that our friends of the minority, or at least some of them, are not ready to make good on another commitment of the Congress of the United States.

Yesterday I commented on the fact that our friends on the minority side, or at least some of them, have been doing everything in their power apparently to create a credibility gap for our Government and to create it by legislative action.

I pointed to the fact with regard to our commitments under the Alliance for Progress, commitments to our neighbors in this hemisphere, that our friends on the minority side had lead a drive to make it impossible to fulfill those commitments for the Alliance for Progress.

Yesterday I pointed out that they had taken another position against fulfilling our commitments to Great Britain with regard to minesweepers, giving Britain an opportunity to bid on Navy minesweepers. Once again they created by their votes and their position yesterday a credibility gap for the United States by voting not to honor a commitment of our Government.

Now we come, my friends, to commitments to the citizens of the United States and commitments to Governors of the several States and commitments to the sovereign States of the Union that are parts of these regional commissions. I point out the fact that when we passed this Appalachian bill in 1965, we said in very clear language, and I think in unmistakable terms, that if it was the decision of the Appalachian Commission to admit the counties in New York into the Appalachian Commission—if it was the decision to bring them in and submit plans for economic development in these counties in New York that the Congress would then act to honor the commitments with regard to those counties in the Appalachian Commission. That is in the bill that was passed in 1965. You will find the specific language on page 17 of the Act. The Appalachian Commission proceeded to admit some of the counties of New York and thereby created a specific need for funding for those counties. Most of the money involved for Appalachia—new money—is money to build this corridor highway across Pennsylvania and the State of New York that was spoken about by the gentleman from Florida.

But here again we have a clear commitment—this time not a commitment of the Secretary of State; this time not a commitment of the Secretary of Defense, but this time we have a commitment of this Congress, if you please—the Congress of the United States—and we propose to fulfill that commitment to the people of New York and to the people of Pennsylvania and of the Appalachia region and to the five new regional Commissions as well, because those were created specifically in accordance with the provisions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is it not true that the gentleman now in the well is the chairman of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works to investigate the workings of the Economic Development Act, and is it not true that that committee has met only once this year for a hearing and that that committee is not fully staffed? Am I substantially correct in that statement?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not think the gentleman is correct in the statement he makes as to the number of times that the subcommittee met. I do not think he

is far from wrong in saying that we are not fully staffed, since, like most subcommittees, we would like to have additional staff if feasible. We have had excellent assistance from the general committee staff, however.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I question the implication of the gentleman in the well—and I have the highest regard for him—that the minority is acting irresponsibly or in bad faith. If you read the minority views carefully, bearing in mind that the investigatory committee to look into the Economic Development Act is totally understaffed and has had only 1 day or so of hearings, I think the minority position to look with askance at adding title II to this bill without benefit of public hearings is not unwise and not unjustified.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Let me say to the gentleman that I have made no implication of bad faith on the gentleman's part intentionally. If the gentleman read that from my remarks, I regret it very much, because when I speak about tactics that are pursued by the other side in their efforts to achieve objectives that I think they have, I certainly do not question their motives and their good faith in connection with those tactics. If the gentleman wants to read something that is injurious to him from the fact that, as I see it, some amendments are being talked about here today that were not offered in the committee, well, I do not believe that is a matter of bad faith. I think that is a matter in this instance of not very good procedure with regard to a matter that you want the committee to accept or agree to.

I think the amendments you are proposing today to enlarge Appalachia and to splinter the New England Commission, if I understand the gentleman correctly in what he is proposing, is something that should have been presented to the ad hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise to acknowledge the talents of the people with whom I have worked and the talent which has been evident on the floor here.

First, I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the full Committee on Public Works, who is one of the finest presiding officers under whom I have ever served in any legislative effort. He is eminently fair, and he gives the minority a chance to be heard.

I am glad to note the broadminded attitude of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], who wants to give us of the minority credit. He calls this the "Jones-Cramer-Schwengel bill." I like that already, but I would like to see it amended so it would be truly bipartisan through the acceptance of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] so that it would be called the "Jones-Cramer-Schwengel-Hays bill." Then it will be vastly improved.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished and capable ranking minority member of the

Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], has very effectively and thoroughly outlined the responsible and constructive minority position on the legislation before us. I wish he would have had time to elucidate further on his version and on his ideas, because he so well expresses the minority attitude and does it so very understandably.

The Appalachian regional development program, as has been suggested, is not based on "creative federalism"; rather, as has also been stated, it is "creative favoritism." It is a program of economic discrimination. It is a program of preferential treatment. It is a program which I believe, in some respects, is misdirected. Certainly, I think it can be proved that it is untimely and, in some respects and in some areas, is cruel.

As we pointed out in the minority report on S. 602, prosperous counties within Appalachia receive special Federal financial assistance while less prosperous counties elsewhere do not. Economically depressed counties in Appalachia receive special financial assistance under both the Appalachian program and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, while economically depressed counties outside Appalachia receive special financial assistance only under the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

Mr. Chairman, as I have just indicated, the name of the Appalachia game is preferential treatment, and, in what I believe to be the best interests of the entire Nation, I feel constrained to voice my objections to this preferential treatment for Appalachia.

I concur strongly in the objections of the minority to the enactment of S. 602, as reported by the committee.

I sincerely hope that all members of this committee will read the minority report.

There are several principal areas of concern which many of us share.

First, sections of the bill before us would authorize the appropriation to the President—I repeat, to the President—of all funds to carry out the Appalachian Regional Development Act, except funds to cover the administrative expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission, which are authorized to be appropriated directly to the Commission. In accord with the objections to this procedure, as outlined today by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], such provisions of the bill should be stricken and the original procedure left intact.

Second, S. 602, as reported, would expand the Appalachian region by adding 24 additional counties. One in New York, one in Tennessee, two in Alabama, and 20 in Mississippi. Some of the areas of Mississippi to be included as part of the Appalachian region if S. 602 is enacted lie west of the longitude of Chicago. This seems to be stretching the definition of the Appalachian region too far. Who knows where it will eventually stop? Maybe Los Angeles? I see no justification, in fact or in theory, for an expansion of this region.

Third, an excessive authorization of funds is contained in S. 602, as reported.

At a time when fiscal matters of the Federal Government must be closely watched, this is no time—as is any time—to authorize an excessive amount of funds. Authorizations should be only for the funds justifiable and not in excess of requests or needs.

Fourth, I am opposed to the adding of new programs in the overall Appalachian development program, including the very questionable low- and moderate-income housing assistance program and the development of a new acid mine pollution control program. Such programs are now being undertaken on a nationwide scale, and I see no need to give the Appalachian region even further specialized treatment, especially when the region has not even made adequate use of programs available to any section of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons alone, every Member should support the minority amendments to S. 602. They are constructive. They are not dilatory. They are in the best interest of good legislation and very much in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to dwell on two matters surrounding this legislation which deserve particular attention: First, the lack of adequate minority staffing to assist the minority members of the Committee on Public Works in carrying out their responsibilities with respect to this legislation; and second, matters relating to the so-called land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control section of the 1965 act, section 203, and amendments thereto embodied in S. 602, as reported. These are matters about which every member of the Committee should know. They are matters which should be called to the attention of all America.

INADEQUATE MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. Chairman, as we pointed out in additional views on S. 602, consideration by the committee of S. 602 again presented the minority members of the committee with the unsurmountable problem of trying to prepare alternative, more effective legislation without staff assistance in the highly specialized field of economics.

Since 1962, the Committee on Public Works has been responsible for handling legislation designed to promote economic development of, and to reduce unemployment in, various portions of the country through Federal grants and loans for public and other facilities, and by providing other types of financial assistance. As additional social legislation was considered by the committee and enacted into law, the minority made repeated requests of the chairman of the committee to authorize the employment of a qualified and experienced economist on the minority staff. All such requests have been rejected.

Mr. Chairman, Federal economic stimulation programs can have far-reaching impact, either beneficial or detrimental, upon both the areas of the Nation to which they apply and other areas which do not qualify for the assistance provided. The massive spending of Federal funds, together with required matching funds, can substantially affect the

economy of the entire Nation, the national debt, inflationary spirals and the value of the dollar, the location of new industrial and commercial enterprises, and decisions to close or to not enlarge existing enterprises.

It goes almost without comment that members must rely upon committee staffs, who are experts in specialized fields, to collect countless volumes of data needed for a full understanding of the problems proposed to be alleviated by legislation, to organize and digest such material into manageable proportions, and to evaluate the material in light of their specialized knowledge and experience. In the absence of such staff assistance, enactment of legislation to cure economic ills must, to a large measure, be pursued in a hit-or-miss fashion without any assurance that the benefits to be produced justify the cost, or that the legislation will achieve the results desired.

I think it important to point out at this point that not only do the minority members of the Committee on Public Works suffer from the lack of an adequate number of staff members with varied professional training and experiences, but so do the majority members. The majority, likewise, has no economist on the committee staff to review, analyze, and make recommendations with respect to the ever increasing social and economic proposals coming before the committee. The minority needs a chief clerk, yet it has none. It needs an economist, yet it has none. It needs an associate counsel to take the load off the back of the majority's chief counsel, yet they have none. They need additional engineering assistance, yet they have none. As every Member can now see, these staffing problems relate to the majority, as well as to the minority. For the second session of the 89th Congress, 1966, the chairman of the committee turned back over \$100,000 in committee funds which went unexpended, at a time when additional staff—majority and minority—was needed. The expenditure of several thousands of dollars for experienced, trained staff, in the long run, could save the American taxpayers millions of dollars. I suggest that the committee leadership is being pennywise and pound-foolish in its staff hiring policies. Why not have well-qualified and adequately compensated staff members? Majority and minority.

The obvious result of inadequate staffing is that the committee must stumble along as best it can without being able to make adequate evaluation of legislation requested by the executive branch, whose witnesses come before the committee armed with facts and figures to prove whatever they desire.

When faced with the substantial amendments contained in S. 602, most minority members desired to make a complete review of the effectiveness of both the Appalachian program and the Economic Development Act program, for there are obvious deficiencies and objectionable features in each. We desired to combine the two programs into one nationwide program to eliminate duplication and to make the resulting program

more effective. We think the vast resources of the private sector of the economy should be made an integral part of a comprehensive economic development program.

When faced with the monumental task of searching out and collecting essential information and data, visiting representative areas of the country to determine their problems and needs, conferring with State and local officials and business and labor leaders in an effort to develop a really workable and effective program, we soon came to the conclusion that our limited, though capable, staff could not even make a dent in this workload in the short amount of time available to us. Reluctantly, I might say very reluctantly, we were forced to abandon, at this time, the development of constructive alternative legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia of the Committee on Public Works during the 88th Congress, I stressed repeatedly the need for a first-hand examination of the Appalachian region and its problems. I repeatedly asked the chairman of that ad hoc subcommittee to make an official factfinding tour of the region. My requests went unanswered. Likewise, no factfinding trips were made into the region, to hold hearings among the people, during the 89th Congress, when the Appalachian Act was enacted. We are being asked to act on legislation without first-hand knowledge, as a committee, of the area, its people, and its problems.

During the summer of 1964, while consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 was proceeding before the ad hoc subcommittee, I launched out with several minority staff members from the committee staff and my office staff and at my own expense to investigate the needs of the region. I held a full day's hearings among the people of this region. What I saw and heard showed to me conclusively that the Appalachian program, as it stands today, will not solve the problems of the region by 1971, the target date for the termination of the Appalachian regional development program. It is, in my opinion, very unfortunate that all members of the committee were not afforded an opportunity to make a fact-finding tour of the region. Even if all the committee members had been unable to make such a tour, it could have been made by the staff—if we had had a full staff complement. But we did not then and do not today.

During the consideration of S. 602 by the Committee on Public Works, the overworked and understaffed minority staff worked many, many nights past midnight, trying to do the work which would have required twice the number of staff members to do justice to the legislation. Yet they stuck with it. And they did a very commendable job with the amendments and the minority report. They are to be praised for it. They should be thanked. We have the most capable minority staff on the Hill, in my opinion, but we need more of them.

As we pointed out in our views in the report, the public interest is not served when a committee of the Congress is unable to properly analyze and evaluate

proposed legislation and to develop alternative measures itself because of the lack of professional staff assistance in specialized fields.

All Members of the House should be able to look to the Committee on Public Works for the detailed evaluation and fully informed consideration of legislation reported by the committee. To the extent that the committee is unable to fully discharge its responsibilities because of inadequate staff—majority and minority—Members of Congress are unable to legislate in the best interest of the American public.

I believe that the best guarantee of sound legislation and good government is knowledge that every legislative proposal on which a Member of Congress is asked to vote is subjected to critical analysis and evaluation, and that the varying viewpoints are fully developed in debate.

For the two-party system to work in the best interest of the American people, however, the minority party, whichever it may be, must be afforded adequate qualified staff assistance to fully discharge its legislative responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, in this instance, we have had to take the only course available to us, and that is to attempt to eliminate the obviously undesirable provisions of S. 602, rather than to propose a comprehensive alternative measure to completely reorient the programs embraced by this bill, which should, in our opinion, be done.

I respectfully ask, on the record, that the committee leadership give further consideration to the staff needs of our committee—majority and minority. The committee will benefit. The American people will benefit.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the point of staffing, so I may clarify one point on that?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has spoken about minority staffing with reference to this particular program. Is it not a fact that both the minority staffing and the majority staffing on the subcommittees that deal with this particular field have been supplied from other subcommittees of the full committee, that the majority side and the minority side are in substantially the same position with reference to staffing on these committees? Is that not correct? No new people have been brought in.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, both majority and minority have inadequate staffs. The Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs, chaired by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], has no staff of its own at all. Its two staff members have been assigned to it on a part-time basis from another subcommittee. How is such a subcommittee to do a good job, under such circumstances?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is it not true that although the Public Works Committee is deeply and heavily involved in economic matters we have no one with any par-

ticular expertise or experience, on either the majority or the minority staff of the committee, who knows anything about economics?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We have no professionally qualified economist on either the majority or the minority side of the aisle. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is it not true, to the gentleman's knowledge, that we have continually requested this type and other expert staff support?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We have requested it on many occasions.

Mr. CLEVELAND. We do not have any statisticians, and we do not have any people with any special knowledge in the field of Appalachia, which essentially is an economic development approach to unemployment, and we do not have anybody with particular expertise, on either the majority or the minority staff, in this regard.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is that not the point the gentleman is addressing himself to?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is exactly the point I am making.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I commend the gentleman in the well, because on this point he is on absolutely and irrefutably sound ground. There is no question that the Public Works Committee has not been staffed with the necessary experts to really consider these matters and really go into them.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I just say to the gentleman, if there are not any economists on the staff, you might be lucky. This is a situation like the one of the old professor I used to have, who gave the same 10 questions on his examination every year, but everyone did not get an A, because he changed the answers every year.

You might be better off because you do not have one on the staff.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I say for the record, I had not intended to get into this aspect of the problem, but I believe the Members know that I and some others have been strong proponents of adequate minority staff, as being the only way the two-party system in Congress or America can really work.

In relation to this particular matter of the EDA Subcommittee, the special investigating and oversight committee, the gentleman who is the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, has correctly stated that no staff has been made available for this specific purpose, although staff has been borrowed from elsewhere.

The staff of the minority side is overborrowed. They do not have time to do this and everything else which needs to be done.

I specifically requested, in the early part of this session, as I am sure the gentleman knows, at least one additional minority staff member, to be somehow

made available specifically for the purpose of trying to provide staffing for the EDA Oversight Committee. If we do not have proper staff for such an oversight committee, there is no way to tell what is tried and true and what will do the job or meet the problem at this time, or any other time.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The gentleman makes a very good point.

Before I yield further to Members I should like to say that the gentleman knows and the minority Members know that our first attempt was to rewrite this bill so as to take out the discrimination and favoritism which is so patently evident here. But we discovered very early that we did not have staff available nor the necessary time to do the kind of job we wanted to do, to provide what we believed would be better answers to the problems we are trying to solve with legislation of this type.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. There has been some discussion about whether the minority has been treated fairly on staffing of the subcommittee, or whether help has been given to the minority.

May I say that when we were the minority party and were minority members of the committee, we had one minority employee on our committee. That was when we were in the minority.

Today the minority has eight, and that compares with not that much of an increase in the staff of the full committee. There has been no increase in the staff of the full committee at all, but the minority has eight employees, more than we had when we were in the minority.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to ask the distinguished chairman a question?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The chairman knows my position on this matter. Is it not true, I ask the distinguished chairman, that early this year, on behalf of the minority, I did request staffing specifically for the purpose of helping to staff the minority on the EDA Oversight Committee? Is that not a correct statement? That is what I said.

Mr. FALLON. That is a correct statement, but there are eight minority employees, from the staffing of the committee.

When we were in the minority we had only one. I might say we were very much more generous and fair when we staffed the committees when we were in power than was true when we were in the minority.

Mr. CRAMER. As far as this Member is concerned, I am living in the present and I am dealing with present problems. I know we have a serious problem with staffing on our side. We only have eight out of 36 staff members. The best evidence of this is that on the EDA Oversight Committee, we believe our request for an additional member for that specific committee was well justified.

Mr. FALLON. The chairman of the subcommittee, who is responsible for

this legislation on the floor today, has not complained about the help or the type of help given him in getting the bill on the floor today. We feel the people who have been working on this bill this year have been very competent and very satisfactory to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one moment further?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You are taking all of my time, and I want to make some observations on this point as well as other material. Yes, I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I simply wanted to concur wholeheartedly in what the chairman just said about the absence of any complaint on behalf of the chairman of the subcommittee. I know the ranking minority member of the subcommittee felt differently about it, but I also know that the ranking minority member has had the benefit of a very able man with a great deal of time and experience devoted to it on the minority side. In the same way we have had the benefit of a very able man from the general staff to assist us. I am personally more interested in ability and quality than I am in quantity.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I request 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. We do not have any time. Perhaps the gentleman on the other side will be able to yield to you.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The minority has committed itself to a new policy on minority staffing. I have introduced legislation to grant the minority, whatever it may be at the time, 40 percent of the staff available to the committee in any session of the Congress.

WATERSHED PROJECTS FOR APPALACHIA

Now I would like to cover one other point. This is the discrimination which is so evident here.

I am a conservationist. I am keenly aware of the importance of watersheds in the food-producing areas of the United States. Those of you who follow this problem closely know that the present program calls for completing the watersheds in these areas by the year 2000, but that is too late. This area in this bill comes under the same program for watersheds that the entire United States does, but through this program you have created 10 additional watershed projects or structures for early completion. That is discrimination. You have Appalachia favored treatment on land that does not compare in any way with the Midwest lands which need watersheds much more urgently than this area does.

SECTION 203: MISDIRECTED, DISCRIMINATORY, UNWISE, UNTIMELY, AND CRUEL

Mr. Chairman, a number of minority members of the committee felt constrained to include supplemental views in the report on S. 602, voicing strong opposition to section 203 of the Appalachian Act of 1965, entitled "Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control," and the provisions of section 108 of S. 602, as reported, to amend section 203, to authorize additional appropriations to carry out that section.

The majority and the minority opposed the enactment of a similar section in 1964, for fear that it would put additional pastureland into production. The minority opposed the enactment of section 203 of the act in 1965, feeling that assurances made to assuage fears of the section were inadequate. I feel that opposition to this particularly unfair and discriminatory section should not lapse and that opposition to any expansion of the program or any additional authorizations for appropriations to carry out the section is essential. I am joined in this view by a number of members of the committee.

There are a number of reasons for our opposition to this section.

First, the section is patently discriminatory to the rest of the Nation.

Second, section 203 funds for erosion control are being expended for the improvement of pastureland and cropland, and for fencing, hunting, fishing and sporting improvements, and recreation.

Third, this is a most un auspicious time to be spending money on pastureland improvement to support larger beef stocks.

Fourth, section 203 has the effect of subsidizing dying, marginal farmland.

And last, the administration unwisely seeks increased authorizations for appropriations for section 203 while at the same time failing to ask for appropriations even equal to the authorizations for the past fiscal years.

Let us look at these in more detail for a moment.

SECTION 203 IS PATENTLY DISCRIMINATORY

The fact that this section is patently discriminatory to the rest of the Nation is beyond question. Yet Appalachia is not a particularly productive agricultural area. To a great degree, if not for the most part, it is a land of upthrust mountain and of narrow valleys, a land of barren rock and scarred earth. Yet, under the provisions of section 203, this region is being given federally financed preferential treatment over the more productive agricultural areas of our Nation, areas which are in in many instances in dire need of preserving immeasurably valuable and fertile topsoil through enhanced conservation, erosion control, and land stabilization measures. The special treatment being afforded to Appalachian farmers is most unfair to other sections of the Nation which need additional assistance to save valuable topsoil that is an essential national resource.

The funds expended for the construction of about 10 watershed projects in the Appalachian region since the enactment of the 1965 Act, for instance, could have been much better expended in areas of tremendous agricultural production and topsoil value, such as the plains region of our great Midwest and the black belt of the Deep South.

SECTION 203 FUNDS BEING EXPENDED ON QUESTIONABLE ITEMS

It was disturbing to us to find that section 203 funds for erosion control are being expended for the improvement of pastureland and cropland, and for fencing, hunting, fishing and sporting improvements, and recreation. There is no provision in section 203 which prohibits

the expenditure of funds under the section for the improvement of pastureland. In the words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], a member of the committee:

I ask you if you can find in that entire section (section 203) one word that relates to livestock or one word that relates to pasture land.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] was right in making that comment during the 1965 hearings on the legislation. Pastureland is not mentioned once in the text of the act. Democrats and Republicans alike fought in 1964 and again in 1965 to obtain assurance that section 203 would not be used for the improvement of pastureland, which would give beef producers in Appalachia a federally financed advantage over food producers in other areas. Yet with what were regarded as reasonable assurances from those in this body responsible for the enactment of the legislation, section 203 was enacted in 1965.

What were some of these reasonable assurances during the 1965 deliberations? Let me quote briefly from a few such assurances:

In hearings before the ad hoc subcommittee on March 3, 1965, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] commented:

The first thing I think we must establish is that, contrary to the expressions made by the minority, this section 203 is not a livestock section in this bill this year. * * * [This] bill contains no such feature as that. * * * I ask you if you can find in that entire section one word that relates to livestock or one word that relates to pasture land. * * * So, unless you want to believe that the Senate, the committee, and the Secretary of Agriculture are all misleading us, and deliberately so, then this is not a livestock section.

During floor debate in the other body, the floor manager for the legislation, the senior Senator from West Virginia, now the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, stated emphatically: "It is not a pasture program."

Mr. Chairman, here are assurances at greater length:

"Mr. WRIGHT. * * * The first thing I think we must establish is that, contrary to the expressions made by the minority, this section 203 is not a livestock section in this bill this year. It has been entirely and completely rewritten from the bill under committee consideration last year to which they have referred. It is quite true, as the gentleman explained, that last year I personally stated if that bill then presenting a program encouraging livestock production on 25 acres of land were to come to the floor in that form, I would offer a motion to strike out that particular section. I strongly felt that it would not be fair to encourage anybody to think he could have a viable livestock operation on 25 acres of land. Nor was it fair to others throughout the country who have been struggling all along to make a living in the livestock industry, where prices are falling, to put others into competition with them.

"But this bill contains no such feature as that. (Emphasis added.)

"I invite your attention to section 203 as completely rewritten in the Senate committee, and again on the floor of the Senate, and I ask you if you can find in that entire section one word that relates to livestock or one word that relates to pasture land. (Emphasis added.) This section is an attempt to control the erosion and siltation, the washing away

of the remaining acres of top soil which would provide the economic possibility of help for these small farmers who have tried and are trying to live and earn their living there.

"A few days ago, I asked the Secretary of Agriculture if there was anything in the section which he could or would use or permit to be used to encourage widespread expansion of livestock operations. He personally assured me that there was not, and said emphatically that such would not be the intent or purpose of the Department of Agriculture. So, unless you want to believe that the Senate, the committee, and the Secretary of Agriculture are all misleading us, and deliberately so, then this is not a livestock section." (Emphasis added.) This is from the remarks of Rep. James C. Wright, Jr., *Congressional Record*, March 3, 1965, daily edition, p. 3901.

"Mr. RANDOLPH. * * * To return to the substitute amendment for section 203, we retain the same funds which were authorized in Senate 3 as it was offered. However, in the Public Works Committee we have broadened the program, and it is oriented more specifically toward soil conservation, land improvement, and erosion and sediment controls.

"I emphasize the fact that the committee amendment provides no assistance for beef raising, and it is not a pasture program." (Emphasis added.) This quote is from the remarks of Senator Jennings Randolph, Floor Manager for the legislation, *Congressional Record*, January 29, 1965, daily edition, p. 1539f.

"Section 203 embodies provisions aimed at conserving the land resources of the region. * * * Such practices as terracing, upstream tanks, flood-control ponds, and the planting of leguminous crops can be of great long-range benefit." This statement is from House Report No. 51, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., entitled "Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965," p. 15.

"Mr. CRAMER. How do you consider this an improvement over that, since the most objectionable section—one of them I think the gentleman from Texas even suggested before the Rules Committee that he felt it should be deleted from the bill? How does this meet the objection raised by many members of this committee?

"Mr. SWEENEY. I would rather have Mr. Wright answer, if the gentleman would yield.

"Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; I would say that this new section inserted by the other body fully meets the objection that those of us had to the section originally contained in the bill, in that we felt that section issuing an invitation and encouragement to the expanded operation of cattle was putting people in the Appalachian region not only in competition with a distressed industry in our country but on the other hand was putting them into an unprofitable and uneconomic business, which they would not find viable themselves.

"* * * So I think it is an entirely different philosophy we have in this section; and I think it completely meets the objections of those of us who found the other bill wholly unacceptable." This colloquy is from hearings before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachia, House Committee on Public Works, February 3, 1965; printed as Committee Print No. 89-2, p. 53f.

Thus, with such assurances as these, section 203 was enacted without the opposition which had arisen to confront it the previous year.

Yet today, section 203 money is being expended by the administration to improve pastureland. I do not, at all, question the faith of those in Congress who gave us these assurances. They were acting on what they had been told by the administration spokesmen. It is the administration whose assurances I

question here today. What I have just quoted reflects these assurances to this body.

The most recent figures on expenditures under section 203 indicate that over three-fourths of all funds expended have been either for improvement of existing pastureland and cropland or for the conversion of unused land into pastureland and cropland, with the remainder of the expenditures being made for the conversion of existing pastureland and cropland into forest land and for other questionable purposes.

"What kind of questionable purposes?" you ask. To our great surprise, we have also discovered that section 203 funds—intended for land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control—have been expended for such diverse items as pastureland fencing, hunting and fishing enhancement, sports facilities improvements, and recreation.

In our opinion, this is pure nonsense, and we stated so in the supplemental views on the bill before us.

UNAUSPICIOUS TIME FOR PASTURELAND IMPROVEMENT

As I indicated earlier, this is a most unauspicious time to be spending Federal money on pastureland improvement to support larger beef stocks.

During the past half decade, the production of beef in the United States and the importation of beef reached alltime highs, resulting in the decline of gross cash receipts for beef producers and a reduction in the average net price of beef for the producer. Although this problem is not as critical today as it was several years ago, it still remains a problem of great concern for our beef-producing and dairy areas.

Since the committee began the consideration of amendments to the 1965 act, I have had an opportunity to discuss section 203 of the 1965 act and amendments thereto embodied in this bill with many beef producers and dairy farmers in the Midwest. These men, who earn their living from the production of beef and dairy products, should not be penalized by unfair competition from federally assisted beef production in Appalachia. These men are still very much concerned over the unfair treatment they are receiving because of the provisions of section 203.

DYING, MARGINAL FARMLAND SUBSIDIZED BY SECTION 203

Section 203 has the effect of subsidizing dying, marginal farmland. As we pointed out in the supplemental views, providing Federal assistance to farms of a marginal character for the improvement of cropland and pastureland will have the effect of subsidizing these marginal units and thus prolonging the inevitable closing of uneconomic farm units and delaying the development of higher and better uses of such land.

We feel this section will perpetuate the status quo rather than doing away with rural poverty.

ADMINISTRATION CANNOT JUSTIFY REQUESTS

As I indicated earlier, the administration unwisely seeks increased authorizations for appropriations for section 203 while at the same time failing to ask for appropriations even equal to the author-

izations for past fiscal years. The administration's own budgetary actions with respect to section 203 show better than anything else that the program is not needed in Appalachia. The 1965 act authorized the appropriation of \$17 million to carry out section 203 for the last 3 months of fiscal year 1965 and for all of fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Despite the administration's cries about the need for these funds in the Appalachian region, the administration requested only \$12.88 million appropriations for section 203 for that 27-month period. This was some \$4.12 million less than that authorized by the Congress, an authorization in the amount the administration requested. Of the \$12.88 million requested by the administration, only \$10 million was appropriated by an administration-dominated 89th Congress. The \$10 million appropriated is slightly more than one-half of the authorizations for the section. To me, this does not indicate a great need for section 203 expenditures in Appalachia.

Despite the obvious lag in implementation of this section, the administration has asked for an increased authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, to carry out section 203, in the amount of an amazing \$19 million. Yet the administration has requested an appropriation of only \$3 million of this \$19 million for fiscal year 1968, leaving an authorization balance of \$16 million for fiscal year 1969. The request of a mere \$3 million for fiscal year 1968 indicates to me that this program is not needed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make this closing statement. At the proper time amendments will be presented which will vastly improve this bill. I have one which will strike title I, not with the view of halting the objectives of this program but with a view toward going back and taking a new look at the total need for all of the United States so that the methods of solving the problems in the Appalachia region can be applied nationwide, and with such a revised program we could eliminate waste and foolishness and duplication and thus have a program which we can truly say is a creative Federal program.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 250]

Adair	Flynt	O'Hara, Mich.
Aspinall	Gallagher	Pirnie
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Resnick
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Rivers
Brademas	Hansen, Wash.	Rumsfeld
Celler	Hawkins	St Germain
Clawson, Del	Hébert	Saylor
Cochran	Holland	Sikes
Collier	Irwin	Ullman
Conyers	Kazen	Vander Jagt
Corman	McCarthy	Willis
Daddario	McCulloch	Wilson
Diggs	McMillan	Charles H.
Dulski	May	Wolff
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Wyatt
Evins, Tenn.	Multer	
Feighan	Murphy, N.Y.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 602, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 382 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE].

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against this bill again this year despite the fact that it has been generally conceded to be one of the better run Great Society programs. I am sure there is considerable virtue in the program, and that it benefits some persons in a depressed part of the country. It is 80 percent a highway construction program, and as such, it takes some pressure off State highway construction and permits other highway funds to be allocated in greater proportion to other sections of the country not fortunate—or unfortunate—enough to be physically part of the Appalachian chain.

But this does not mean that the criteria of the program are sound. It still rests on discriminatory geographic factors rather than economic factors. No matter how much we vote to broaden the program geographically—efforts I will generally support—some deprived parts of the country still will not have the opportunity under this bill to prove their claims to Federal participation in public works designed to improve their economic climate.

I must confess this is another reason why I am not supporting this bill, Mr. Chairman. I am sitting in the daily deliberations of the Ways and Means Committee, having witnesses testify in behalf of the President's surtax proposal as an antidote for the poor fiscal condition of the country. We are told constantly that the poor will suffer the most from the inevitable inflationary results of a Federal deficit in excess of \$25 billion. And I am satisfied from soundings of my own that the tax surcharge cannot be passed at this point, largely because of a failure of support by those small liberal Democrats of whose vision of the larger role of the Federal Government this bill speaks. Mr. Chairman, something has to give, whether some in this Chamber are willing to admit it or not. I do not enjoy voting against this kind of program any more than anyone else, but the time is late and the condition serious. Since this is primarily a public works bill, with a discriminatory geographic base, we can cut one-half billion dollars here much more easily than in many other authorization bills that will be before us.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman,

I rise in support of the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967. Of particular interest to me is the addition of 20 northeast Mississippi counties to the Appalachian program, of which three are located in my congressional district.

I have watched very closely the results of the Appalachian program as it has been applied in the several States involved since its enactment. I find this to be one of the best programs ever enacted by the Congress to assist the underdeveloped areas of our Nation.

The program was born out of the desire of the people in the area, working through their Governors with the Federal agencies in a true spirit of partnership. This partnership has demonstrated beyond our fondest dreams what can be done when local initiative and know-how, coupled with our Federal capability, are put to work on economic problems.

I am grateful to the members of the subcommittee and of the full Committee on Public Works for adding 20 counties in Mississippi to the area designated to participate in the benefits authorized in the bill. I had hoped 26 counties in Mississippi that have a real desire to become a part of this program could be included. The judgment of the committees was such that the area of my State added was limited to the 20 counties included.

It is not only desirable but inevitable that northeast Mississippi be incorporated in the Appalachian program. The economic structure of northeast Mississippi is, and has been, historically an integral and inseparable part of the southern Appalachian region. Geographically, these 20 counties are a part of and contiguous to the southern Appalachian range, sharing common problems and potentialities. It is my firm belief that the addition of these counties to the Appalachian program will be mutually beneficial to all concerned.

I would like to respectfully request that my colleagues join me in supporting this very important measure.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], a member of the committee.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the ad hoc committee and of the full committee which considered this legislation, I rise to enthusiastically support the bill now under consideration.

At this time I highly commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], the chairman of our ad hoc committee, for his thorough and objective presentation made on the floor of the House this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, the Appalachian Regional Development Act was requested by the Governors of the States in the Appalachian region.

The Commission resulted following long and thorough discussions which actually started in 1960.

Mr. Chairman, these States in the Appalachia region did not and do not have the financial resources to do the job that must be done. I compliment these Governors because they did not sit down and cry and wring their hands. They did something about it. The individual

States asked for this help. The Commission has been in operation now for 2 years. During this period of time it is amazing to see the close cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in starting so effectively to solve the problems of the region. My entire home State of West Virginia is in the heart of the Appalachia region. It should be noted that every decision made by the Commission—that is, the Federal coordinator and each of the Governors, has been by unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, this accomplishment has been unexcelled. Through this legislation the Appalachia region is moving ahead economically. With the passage of the legislative proposal before us today the Appalachia region will not only have a chance but it will make its full contribution to our national output and to our national wealth; it will continue to create and make its contribution to a stronger America.

The two most effective provisions of this act provide for assistance. These two items are: First, the construction over a period of 6 years of the Appalachia highway program. Specifically this is development highways and access roads so essential to our economic growth and development. Second, the vocational educational facilities to train those about to enter the labor force and to the upgrading of skills for those presently unemployed so that they can qualify for productive employment in private industry.

Mr. Chairman, in brief, the Federal funds that have been spent and which will be spent under this program will prove to be an investment in the future of our Nation. Mr. Chairman, therefore, because I have seen with my own eyes, coming from the heart of the Appalachia region, the justification for this investment to create a sound economic base, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this legislation without amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I want to commend my friend for the statement he has made and commend the sponsors of this legislation. I also wish to express my support for this legislation, especially the provisions of title II which are important to the four States in the four corners region, that is, Arizona, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, S. 602, revising and extending the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and amending title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, will be of particular value to the four corners region of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona.

This region, the most recent to be designated as such under title V of the latter act, now has a distinguished Federal co-chairman, the Honorable Orren Beaty, Jr. Mr. Beaty was nominated by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and on August 17, 1967, took his oath of office. Together with the Governors of the four participating States he has moved rapidly to inaugurate regional economic development planning in our region. Next Tues-

day, September 19, the organizational meeting of the Four Corners Regional Commission is to take place, at the point where the four States come together.

The 92 counties of the four States in the four corners region will benefit promptly from the passage of S. 602 as recommended by the committee. While a thoroughgoing comprehensive, region-wide development plan is worked out, substantial progress can be shown by the supplemental funds that will be made available by this proposed act. Our experience with, and reports on, the Appalachian program graphically demonstrate the value of supplemental assistance for Federal grant-in-aid programs. Authorization of \$5 million, per region, for fiscal year 1968, and \$10 million, per region, for fiscal year 1969 will be of substantial help to the regional commissions. The Federal cochairmen have already begun work on the best possible application of the supplemental funds sought to be made available. The regional Commissions, composed of the Governors and the Federal cochairmen, must approve each program or project in accordance with established criteria. All will be based on a long-range comprehensive economic plan. This amendment will permit an increase in the Federal share up to 80 percent in any covered program. All applications for such supplements must come through the State members of the Commission.

I strongly urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KEE. I am delighted to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to compliment the distinguished gentleman on his statement and to associate myself with his position. I also wish to say that he has been one of those who have really fought for this program and he has been a bulwark of strength in his support of it.

Mr. Chairman, I also at this time wish to pay my respects to this fine committee and the excellent work of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who for years has been one of the builders of America as a member of the Committee on Public Works and as a Member of the House.

Mr. KEE. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I support the pending bill which revises and extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

For the impact which it has had in my own district and on the State of Pennsylvania, I must say that the Appalachian regional development program is one of the best programs enacted as long as I have been a Member of Congress.

The Appalachian region covers a lot of territory from New York to Alabama and contains a lot of problems which have to be corrected if the region is to share fully in the national economic prosperity. Northeastern Pennsylvania is quite different from eastern Kentucky

just as northern Alabama is quite different from western North Carolina. Yet all of these Appalachian States have something in common. They all share a particular problem or set of problems which have retarded their economic growth throughout the century.

The genius of the Appalachian program is that it is designed to permit solutions for different problems peculiar to the several areas of the region.

The anthracite region of Pennsylvania has for almost a century suffered heavy consequences from the mining of the world's largest deposits of anthracite coal. The Appalachian program has in its short lifetime brought new hope to the people of northeastern Pennsylvania by dealing with one of the area's most serious problems today—the debris left from a hundred years of intensive mining.

Let me illustrate how this works under the Appalachian program as applied to my part of Appalachia and to the part of Appalachia represented by Mr. PERKINS and Mr. CARTER in eastern Kentucky. Northeastern Pennsylvania is not receiving highways under the Appalachian highway development system because when this regionwide system was planned in 1965, northeastern Pennsylvania was very adequately served by the Interstate System. Five Interstate highways criss-cross the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton area, providing excellent access to New York, Philadelphia, New England, Canada, and the Midwest.

Eastern Kentucky—and West Virginia I might add—showed a very great need for new modern highways to serve areas which are bypassed by the Interstate Highway System and it is in Kentucky and West Virginia where almost 900 miles of Appalachian highways will be built—where the need is greatest. This, I believe, is as it should be.

On the other hand, anthracite Pennsylvania has a very serious problem which is highly unique. Hundreds of square miles of land are threatened by subsidence as a result of underground mining activities. Mine fires—both above and below the ground—pose a constant threat to human lives, property and industry. These fires—some of which have burned for over 50 years—pollute the air with their foul, obnoxious gases and endanger the health and safety of people in the area.

The Appalachian program has provided the means to attack these situations on a far larger scale than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, it is unthinkable that this House would cut back the splendid efforts and progress that have been made over the past 2 years in restoring the ravaged coal mining areas of the Appalachian region.

The \$30 million authorized in this bill for mining restoration is the minimum amount of money necessary to carry the reclamation efforts generated by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

Let me point out that the funds already appropriated under the Appalachian Act for putting out mine fires and filling mine voids are bringing new life at this very moment to communities in

Pennsylvania and other parts of Appalachia.

The Appalachian States have also made special efforts, to match the special efforts that the Federal Government has made under the Appalachian program to restore the abuses of past mining operations. We cannot and we must not disappoint them nor can we turn our backs on the people in the communities whose very futures depend on ending the threat of mine fires and mine subsidence.

Three years ago—in the summer of 1964—I testified before the Public Works Committee on the need for the Appalachian program and what benefits it could bring to Pennsylvania's anthracite areas. At that time, I specifically cited the desperate mine-fire situation that existed in Laurel Run Borough, adjacent to my town of Wilkes-Barre. I told the committee that Laurel Run mine fire had been burning for 45 years and the Federal and State officials were trying to decide what to do about it. This was a fire that if allowed to burn unchecked could have spread through the entire city of Wilkes-Barre, causing a disaster of unprecedented proportions.

Since 1964, we have made progress on the Laurel Run fire which covers the entire side of a mountain. This progress was made possible by the Appalachian program which has contributed \$3 million toward extinguishing the fire. The \$3 million has been matched by \$1 million in State funds—for a total of \$4 million which will thwart the fire, thus literally saving Wilkes-Barre from immolation.

Four million dollars is a lot of money, but it is not too much for the protection of human lives, nor for the protection of property worth many times that amount.

The \$24,850,000 which has been appropriated for mining restoration projects under the Appalachian program has been used wisely. It is of peculiar significance to anthracite Pennsylvania. The \$30 million authorization, in the bill under discussion today, is essential to the economic future of Wilkes-Barre and Scranton and many other communities in Pennsylvania's anthracite region.

The \$30 million authorization for mining reclamation projects is the absolute minimum of Federal money needed to continue this work during the next 2 years. Let no one be fooled into believing that the Federal Government is taking all the responsibility in bearing all the costs for these programs.

The State of Pennsylvania has already made substantial investments toward putting out mine fires and preventing surface subsidence. The State will be making even larger investments in the future. This year Pennsylvania voters approved a \$500 million bond issue to accelerate the State's conservation efforts over the next 10 years. Fifty million dollars of that sum has been earmarked by the State for extinguishment of underground mine fires and burning culm banks. These State funds will be used with the money authorized by the Appalachian Act to put an end to the long-standing problems that have plagued our coal areas.

There can be no doubt that Pennsylvania seriously intends to do all it can in combating mine fires and mine subsidence. The Pennsylvania Legislature is currently considering a bill which would give the Pennsylvania Department of Mines and Mineral Industries the right, without liability, to enter upon private lands to combat mine fires, refuse bank fires and subsidence resulting from mining.

Extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act will continue the valuable work of the Appalachian program in its broad-based and long-range attack upon the problems of Appalachia. This program has started the actions which are necessary to cure the problems of deteriorating communities, the rehabilitation of mining areas, the serious education problems which have held the region back, and the inadequate access that has long plagued Appalachia.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to associate myself with those who have spoken in laudatory commendation of the able gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] and for the policy and political wisdom which he has followed and which was established by the gentleman's distinguished father in bringing into fruition this dream and the impact which it may have upon the people throughout this land.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for his remarks on this legislation, and I hope that this program will go forward and that it will even more prove to be a program which will realize the aspirations which the gentleman from West Virginia has so long maintained.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us having to do with Appalachia has included in its extension 20 counties in Mississippi. These counties are a continuation not only of the terrain and topography of the Appalachia region but to a very great degree have all of the problems that the original counties have.

I have had the privilege of representing a number of these counties through the years since I first came to the Congress and others since the first of January. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that when the original Appalachia program was proposed north Mississippi counties were included in the study and in the counties designated as qualified, or so it was generally accepted. At that time, however, this being a new program, the State of Mississippi did not take action to be included and that is the reason these counties have not been in the program all the time.

Mr. Chairman, I earlier introduced a bill which went before this Committee on Public Works, which would include the counties to the foothill area adjoining the delta. The committee felt it could not include those counties but did

include eight counties within my present district.

May I say to you and to the membership of the Committee that this area is badly in need of additional highways and access roads, which if this bill is passed I understand could be studied and plans provided within the present calendar year. There also is an urgent need for additional vocational education programs to qualify many of the people who have been displaced from the farms, through mechanization, for other work.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that all things look differently to those who are in different positions. As the membership knows, I have served for some years as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture, where we have tried to deal with the problems of geographic areas on a fair basis, even though the same funds do not go to other regions which have different problems. In other words, we have tried to be fair and objective. Also, as you know, I serve on the Committee on Appropriations for Public Works. This year, with few exceptions, just about every member of Congress was before that committee requesting Federal assistance with which to meet problems in their area. The committee made every effort to be fair to all members and all regions, and I make no apologies for the funds we provided in our appropriations bill, for I long since made a distinction between the funds for all the protection and development of our own country and those that go to questionable programs. I trust the membership will support the inclusion of these new counties in the bill before us, for as I pointed out to the committee, for generations we have provided Federal funds for New York Harbor, for the harbor at San Francisco, and Tampa, Fla. Billions of dollars have been spent on navigation of certain of our rivers and on flood control in many, many areas. Now I ask, if it so happens that a region such as the Appalachia region does not happen to have a harbor and does have all these other problems, would it not be sound to have a program which meets the problems of such area?

Thus, again, I hope we can have the support of the membership in retaining these 20 counties of Mississippi in the program. They do not have a harbor and only one county touches a navigable stream for only a few miles. They do, however, have low income, need for roads, need for vocational education, and many other things. I think we all should be convinced that the development of one segment of our country has always proven to be of great benefit to all of our country. It is on this basis that I have worked as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture and as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works. I trust that those who come before these committees will look at this matter objectively and realize that while the geography is different and the problems are in a different area, it is worthy of Federal assistance just as much as the harbors and navigable streams are to other sections.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read here the statement made by Mr. Thompson Pound, executive secretary, Tombig-

bee River Valley Water Management District, who appeared both for himself and Governor Johnson before the committee, as well as a letter from Governor Johnson:

STATEMENT OF THOMPSON POUND, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, TOMBIGBEE RIVER VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

MR. POUND. Thank you, Chairman Jones, and members of the committee. I am happy for the privilege of appearing before your committee on behalf of Governor Johnson, who sends his regrets in not being able to meet with you today. He is very interested in Mississippi becoming a part of the Appalachian program and has asked me to represent Mississippi in your hearing. I have with me Governor Johnson's statement and a report that I would like to present for your consideration.

The laws of the Appalachian Regional Act of 1965 have been studied by us and we are in accord with the legislative intent of the act. In making a study of the social and economic problems of the 373 counties that are a part of the Appalachian program, we find that the 26 counties in the hill section of northeastern Mississippi share the economic and social characteristics of the southern portion of the region, and are in the Appalachian terrain, or are contiguous to the Appalachian region. There already exist multiple-county activities among the hill counties in northern Mississippi. It is felt that the inclusion of this portion of the State of Mississippi will further the purpose of the Appalachian Act, as outlined in section 2.

The operations and functions of the Appalachian Regional Commission have been observed by us and we think this is an effective and efficient organization—one which we like and can work with.

We have prepared a file of information which backs up our decisions, and beliefs. I would like to leave it with you for your considerations.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson, May 5, 1967.

HON. GEORGE FALLON,
Chairman, Public Works Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I very much appreciate the opportunity to present information relative to the possible inclusion of an area of Northeastern Mississippi in the Appalachian Regional Development Program. We in Mississippi are greatly pleased that the United States Senate has seen fit to include in the Appalachian Regional Development Act, S. 602, an amendment providing for participation by 18 Mississippi counties in the Appalachian Regional Program. It is to your interest and decision on this question that my comments and the attached materials are directed.

I should like, respectfully, to submit to your committee a report to me relative to Mississippi's participation in the Appalachian program which was prepared by Mr. Thompson Pound, Executive Secretary, of the Tombigbee River Valley Water Management District, Tupelo, Mississippi, and was submitted to me originally on July 1, 1966.

I want to stress to the committee that we in Mississippi were originally attracted to the Appalachian program on its merits and that we intend to pursue our participation in the program on that basis over and above the fact that Northeastern Mississippi is clearly related by the nature of geography and economics to the contiguous southern portion of the Appalachian region.

The past history of developmental activity by the people of Northeastern Mississippi bears out a further relationship to the philosophy and working approach of the Ap-

palachian program. The community and area development activities in and around Tupelo, Mississippi, has been a subject of international interest for a number of years. Repeated study and visitation by interested persons from many places have given what is called "The Tupelo Plan" a highly regarded reputation among students of economic and social development. Similarly, the comprehensive approach to area development in which the interest and involvement of local people is directly tied in with a broad approach to resource development follows the same philosophy and has attracted wide respect in the development field. Within our state government in Mississippi, we are carefully but aggressively pursuing the comprehensive area approach for all parts of our State. Through our state agencies and our Research and Development Center, as well as our universities and development organizations throughout the State, we are relating our public activities to those goals which are carefully designed to bring about increased citizen action as well as technical support for the creation of job opportunities, higher income and improved living conditions in our communities. The people in Mississippi are becoming increasingly involved in programs of this type and are increasingly successful in the contributions they are making to help themselves toward development objectives.

For these reasons, I am not surprised but I am greatly pleased that the interest in joining the Appalachian program came directly from the people through their area development leadership in Northeastern Mississippi.

I am positive that when I carry the request of these people that they be given the opportunity to participate in the Appalachian program, I can assure you that their participation will add to the effectiveness of the program and will live up to the high standards of accomplishments which this program has thus far established.

Along this line, I particularly want to make it clear that I regard the Appalachian Regional Program as the finest example of government in action today on a basis which can effectively deal with the kinds of problems confronting our people in these complex and difficult times.

I believe that this program can deliver the promise of the affluent society to all of our people in a constructive, sound and progressive fashion.

Our interest in the Appalachian program was not developed shortly nor is it based on the expectation of short-range returns. I have discussed our interest in this program since the very inception of the Appalachian Regional Development Act with the other governors of the region, with the officials and staff of the Appalachian Commission and with our Mississippi people. We have constantly received encouragement from all of these persons to the end that our case was sound for inclusion in the program in that our reputation for progressive area development made our request for inclusion in the program welcome. We would not have pursued this interest without the encouragement of the people who have worked so hard and so successfully to make this new approach sound and effective.

The enclosed report, I believe, constitutes evidence of our sincere interest in this program, outlines the benefits that can be derived from participation and describes the type of cooperation that can be expected from Mississippi in the event the Regional Appalachian Development Act is amended to include my State. The report relates to the possible inclusion of 26 counties. The interest in Mississippi extends to those counties rather than to just the 18 counties provided for in the amendment to S. 602 passed by the Senate. However, we in Mississippi will certainly respect the judgment of the Congress in your final determination.

The first three years of my administration have been blessed with notable success in implementing an agricultural, industrial and commercial economic developing program, which has contributed much to the steady progress and sound growth of this State.

I can think of no better way of closing my administration than by insuring this State's participation in what I believe is the most significant regional development program initiated during the 20th Century.

Your assistance in securing this end would, indeed, be sincerely appreciated by me and by the people of the State of Mississippi.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. JOHNSON, Governor.

MR. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

MR. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, before beginning my remarks, which will chiefly be devoted to an amendment that I shall offer at the appropriate time, I would like to continue for a bit upon the colloquy which we had earlier in connection with the minority staffing problem and, actually, the entire staffing problem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, during the colloquy with reference to the staffing problem, there was some reference to the fact that the minority had eight people on the Public Works Committee staff. We are grateful for this. However, the fact should be remembered—and I want the RECORD to show it—that during the past year the Public Works Committee has concerned itself also with the problems of highway safety, large dams, as well as the problem commonly referred to as the "billboard" problem and the problem of highway beautification, the cutback in the highway program which concerned so many of us last winter, disaster relief, as well as the very important problem of water pollution and the problem of toll roads as well as other items.

Mr. Chairman, the pending legislation upon which we are called to act involves previous appropriations as well as future authorizations of \$1,400 million.

So, I do not believe when we are discussing the problem of staffing that we should get into a numbers game as to how many staff members we have. The question for the consideration of this body is whether or not we have an adequate staff with which to perform our constitutional duties.

Mr. Chairman, the point, I believe, that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGER] was making, as well as the point which was so well made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and the point which I am undertaking to make is simply this: That we are not adequately staffed to effectively and properly acquit our responsibilities as Members of Congress, a responsibility which extends across a broad spectrum of programs.

I believe the RECORD should make that indubitably clear. It is not just a matter of how many we have, and if we have more than the minority of yesteryear used to have. The question is whether we have enough to do the job properly.

I might say in that connection it is regrettable—and I welcome the opportunity while I am speaking about general matters of congressional reform to call the attention of the Members to the fact that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 is still tied up in the Committee on Rules. It has been there for more than

5 months, with only 1 day of hearings on it. It passed the Senate, as all of us know, after 3 weeks of debate last March by an overwhelming vote.

Now, about my amendment: The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has criticized me in advance for offering my amendment which, briefly, will include the crowning glory of the Appalachian Mountains in the Appalachian region. He has criticized me for bringing it in now and in not submitting it to the committee. I will address myself to that point right now.

The reason this amendment was not brought in earlier was that the minority on the Committee on Public Works first considered the possibility of introducing a constructive alternative not only to the Appalachian Act, but the Economic Development Act. Our alternative would apply not only to one region of this country, but it would be a national program; it would apply to all 50 States equally, just as our highway programs do, and most of our other programs do.

We had under consideration a constructive alternative that would take the best of Appalachia and the best of the Economic Development Act and apply this on a broad national scale, which is the way we should legislate, because this is a national legislative body.

It soon turned out because of the limitation of time and staff that this approach was impossible. As a result of that I have now turned to my amendment which will bring in parts of New York State, the Adirondack Range, the hills of northwestern Connecticut, the Berkshire Mountains of Massachusetts, the Green Mountains of Vermont, the White Mountains of New Hampshire, and the Mount Katahdin range in Maine.

Anybody who knows anything about mountains knows these mountain chains are a legitimate part of the Appalachian Mountains.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I cannot yield just now, because I understand we are running short of time on our side, but I will yield as soon as I have concluded.

The World Book Encyclopedia defines the Appalachian Mountains as the chief mountain system of eastern North America and the oldest mountains in the United States:

They stretch southwestward for about 1,500 miles from the Gaspé Peninsula in Quebec—

Be of good cheer, I am not tying Quebec into the amendment—

to central Alabama. The mountains are part of the Appalachian region which extends into Newfoundland—

And I do not have that in the amendment either—

The chief ranges of the northern Appalachians are * * * the Green Mountains in Vermont, the White Mountains in New Hampshire, and the Adirondack Mountains in New York.

I have to my left here a map of the United States, a topographical map. Anybody who looks at this map has to admit that the Adirondacks, the Berkshires, the

White Mountains, and the Green Mountains should definitely be included in Appalachia.

Mr. JONES mentioned during his testimony that the chief characteristics of the Appalachian area were coal mining, lumbering, and farming. It is perfectly true that in Northeastern United States there is not much coal mining, but the fact of the matter is that it was lumber and farming that were the chief sustaining economic forces of the northeastern part of the Appalachian Mountains.

And as Congressman McEwen and I sat through the Appalachian hearings, and as they described the situation in the Appalachian Mountains of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, North Carolina, western Virginia, and so forth, and the other parts of that chain that were described, it was exactly what had happened in the northern New England region. There, too, we have had a problem with the small, declining farms. There, too, we have had troubles with forests that have been cut and not fully replaced. There, too, we have had the problem of outmigration to the cities, leaving a declining number of people to support the tax base and to make it attractive for new industries to move in.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose is one that I hope the committee will accept. I think in all fairness that the committee should accept it. All of the logic and supporting evidence that supports the Appalachian regional act applies equally to the northernmost part of this chain of mountains. It is difficult for me to conceive of having this legislation enacted without including in it a legitimate part of the mountain chain and area for which it is named. This is so particularly in view of the fact that the need for the act and the described conditions in the area are almost identical with the northern part of New York State and northern New England.

These problems that they encounter, their economic problems, are almost identical with the problems that are faced by other parts of Appalachia.

Now I want to point out in conclusion one more reason that makes the case for my amendment almost irrefutable.

Consider this map that is here before you—consider please that they are adding many counties in Mississippi. I am not necessarily opposed to adding these counties in Mississippi, but consider the topographical map—these counties in this area are not as much a part of the Appalachian chain as the counties I am asking to include in northern New York and New England.

I ask all of you to study this map before you pass judgment on my amendment which will be offered at the appropriate time.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Your amendment will cover the broad spectrum of such areas and people throughout the Nation—that is your intention; is it not?

Mr. CLEVELAND. My intention is to

add the Adirondack Mountain Range, the Berkshires, the Green Mountains, the White Mountains, and the Mount Katahdin area.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Do you not think that when you are adding the counties in Mississippi and northern New York, you should also include in your amendment the riot-torn pockets of poverty in the cities?

Mr. CLEVELAND. As a matter of fact, I welcome the gentleman's question because what the Republican minority was attempting to do, as I described it earlier, was to devise legislation which would take the best of the Economic Development Act and the best of the Appalachian Act and then enact legislation which would apply nationally, through the States. If that were done, some of the drive and some of the focus of this type of legislation might well apply to the cities.

Let me add this—for the gentleman's benefit—at least some of us on the Committee on Public Works, as we have listened to the testimony before us have come to the conclusion that the problem of the city is back to back with the problem of rural decline.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CLEVELAND. May I ask for a couple of minutes of additional time?

Mr. CRAMER. As the gentleman knows, the time has been allotted. Perhaps the gentleman on the other side of the aisle can yield some time to the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, some of the members on the Committee on Public Works have been very impressed with the fact that the problem of the cities is back to back with the problem of rural decline. This is so because as rural areas decline, it often forces people to go to the cities and as they go to the cities they create problems there, which apparently some of the cities are not equipped to handle.

Some of us on the Committee on Public Works feel and I think this is true of some of the Members on both sides of the aisle, that one of the keys—but not the only solution—but one of the keys to this problem will be to reverse this outmigration from the country into the city, and to help to alleviate some of the problems of the cities.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Does not the gentleman think that at this time when you are assisting the rural areas and the mountain areas throughout the country, you also might think of the depressed areas and about the people who because of their lack of jobs and opportunities and means to make a living find it necessary to riot in order to call attention to their deplorable condition? Do you not think at this time that we should also seek to aid those areas in the cities where there are explosions and where there will continue to be explosions throughout the next year or 2 years, and who knows for how long?

It would seem to me that this would be an appropriate time for me to suggest

that you include your amendment, and I would be satisfied to allow you to handle the amendment which I will submit at the proper time in order to aid those pockets of poverty in the riot-torn cities throughout our Nation.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I support the pending bill to extend the Appalachian program. I know this program is working in Georgia and I know it is working overall, because its approach is sound. Any program which lets the States pace the Federal Government, I feel, is bound to work.

Georgia knows its problems and I think knows best how to solve them, and that is the heart of this program. The Federal Government is not telling us what to do and how to do it. It is asking us, and that is a very big difference.

I know the program is working in my district because I can see the promise as well as the fulfillment in soil conservation, school and college improvements, airport, hospital, health care, libraries, and nursing homes. I know that tying the district to the rest of the State and to other parts of Appalachia with highways and access roads is good because it is a need fulfilled.

I know what this means to our people because ultimately it is they, through their Governor, who have asked for them. So I know that Appalachian funds, together with the other Federal money the Appalachian program has attracted, is well spent, and I urge approval of the legislation.

These programs have received support from members of this Committee whose districts are not affected, for they know that the development of regional resources and the solution of regional problems is good for the country as a whole. All of these programs receive support well beyond the areas where their benefits are felt, because all of them are judged by their contribution to the Nation as a whole.

More purchasing power in Appalachia means greater demand for goods and services produced in other parts of the country. A stronger Appalachian economy means a stronger national economy. Thus the Appalachian program serves the needs of the Nation. The Nation has decided it will no longer tolerate the continued existence of poverty, unemployment, and underdevelopment which exists in this region.

A great deal has been said and written recently about the plight of the cities. I believe that all concerned recognize that the problems of the cities stem in large part from the influx of untrained, unskilled people from the rural areas of this Nation. Much of this migration has come from the Appalachian region, which has lost 2 million people to cities of the North and the Northeast in the two decades between 1940 and 1960. This outmigration will continue with the high toll both to the region and to the urban areas of the country unless something is done to provide opportunities closer to home. This fact is beyond contest.

Mr. Chairman, the statement that the Appalachian program constitutes preferential treatment or is discriminatory against other areas of the country is grossly misleading. Practically every bill that comes before this House is preferential in one way or another. The Appalachian Act was passed because Appalachia was viewed as a national problem. It was thought to be wiser to invest money to make this region self-sustaining rather than to continue to pour funds into a welfare program.

This decision was made out of concern for the people of the Appalachian region, but it was also made as a wise public policy for the Nation as a whole. It is true that the immediate benefits from this legislation flow only to a designated area. The highways, the schools, the hospitals are to be built within the Appalachian region. Their effect will eventually be enjoyed by the country as a whole, by making this region self-sustaining and able to carry its load in paying taxes to the Federal Treasury.

What is discriminatory, please, about linking up the great southeastern metropolis of Atlanta, Ga., with that fine beautiful and growing city in western North Carolina, Asheville, and providing an opportunity for the citizens of these two great cities to have an exchange of their products in commerce that does not exist today and increase their capacity to make a contribution to the national economy?

How many bills does this House see which are not designed to benefit some special area or some special group?

Certainly the price support programs for wheat, for cotton, for rice, and for other commodities are limited in application to relatively small areas of the country. The Great Plains Conservation Program is regional in character. TVA and Bonneville and the great reclamation projects of the West are no less regional than the Appalachian program.

Thus, the bill before us is not parochial or regional legislation. It is legislation to serve the national interest, and in a very real sense it is as important to the metropolitan areas of this country as it is to the Appalachian region. Why do we want to deny ourselves the resources with which to prevent these cancers that are developing the cities? Why do we want to continue to leave these people in the rural areas of Appalachia without the skills, without the basic understanding and responsibility of citizenship? Why do we want to leave them to migrate and go out of that country, because they have nothing to do, and allow them to load upon the cities in the stacked-up slums and ghettos, where they will add to the very problems that have brought about the tragedies that we all so deplore, that have happened this summer.

I can tell the Members that in the Appalachian region of the district I am privileged to represent, on the 14th of August we opened a newly constructed area vocational technical school with a capacity to train 400 people. I was astonished on the first day, in the first week of its operation, that more than 300 were clamoring for admission, to learn how to meet the demands in the fields of automobile

repair, of drafting and of designing, of air conditioning and of electronics, of cosmetology and of business training and of welding, all of those things that go to provide the skills that people in this day and time demand, and that the labor market says we must have if our young men and women are going to get the employment that is necessary to make them contributing taxpayers and remove the causes that have made so many of them unfortunately tax eaters.

Talk to me about boondoggling. Talk to me about discrimination. Is it boondoggling or is it discrimination for us to marshal the resources of this great Nation and make them available to the young men and women so they can come into manhood and womanhood and discharge the responsibilities that are going to fall upon them much more heavily than they are falling upon us today?

I never think of this program of Appalachia and what its potential is in setting out examples for the rest of the Nation, that I am not reminded of the inscription etched in the stone above the Speaker's dais here.

That was said in this Chamber by Daniel Webster:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

We are doing something here to conserve and develop human resources. We are not enriching the coffers of any region or any special group. We are enlarging the opportunity for cultural and educational development of the Nation, which the last one-third of the 20th century demands.

I call upon members of the Committee to give us the power which is in this act, to prescribe the preventive medicine which is in this act, and let us treat these problems in such a way as they may not continue to grow and plague us.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McEWEN].

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, when the amendment is offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, I shall join in supporting that amendment to bring into the Appalachian region northern Appalachia.

I have listened to what many of my colleagues have said here today about the benefits of this program and what it means to the Appalachian region.

Tomorrow, if that be the time when the gentleman from New Hampshire offers his amendment to bring in the Appalachian areas of New York, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, I shall be supporting a concept which I advocated in this House when the original Appalachian Regional Act was before us 2 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to treat with the problems of Appalachia, I fail to see why we should not in this act embrace all of Appalachia. I am referring to that part of the Appalachian chain which lies in New York and the New England States. The problems of the lack of job opportunities and outmigration which

have been indigenous to southern Appalachia have prevailed there also.

I hope, at the proper time, when the amendment is offered, those who support this concept will support the amendment and bring the Appalachian Regional Commission to the entire Appalachian area.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT].

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay my tribute to the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the chairman of the ad hoc subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and also my gratitude to our respective ranking members of the minority, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Their help in guiding me to an understanding of legislation and duties before our committee has meant much. Having this deepest respect for their knowledge and background, I feel, perhaps, a little frustrated in finding myself on the opposite side.

Mr. Chairman, I stand generally in favor of the bill we consider today. By and large, this is a good measure. It returns decisions of Federal spending and programs back to the community and State.

I am especially heartened by the title II provisions which will enable the continuation of administrative bodies and planning actions related to five separate economic regions of the country, judged in need of help—namely those areas served by commissions in the Ozarks, the Great Lakes, New England, coastal plains, and the four corners regions. It is quite important that these programs be sustained, even in times of budgetary problems. To eliminate or retard the development of these regions in their capacity to plan to act—in the name of economy—would, indeed, be serving false economy. The ends of false economy are, I am sure, those we would use all means to avoid.

All in all, the measure seeks to sustain and further implement the program known as Appalachian regional development. At this time I am generally opposed to enlargement of this section. The measure also seeks to sustain and further implement, to a smaller extent, the regional commissions which have been established to seek solutions to long-time economic ills in five other geographic areas.

These problems are such that they have no chance of being solved by inaction. We must act. And, we must act largely as provided in this bill.

I regret that in committee we did not maintain the boundaries of Appalachia as prescribed in the original legislation. As you know, the concept of regional development is based on common socioeconomic conditions needing particular treatment so as to improve per capita income. I believe we will do serious damage to this concept if we expand this area without regard to the established criteria.

Mr. Chairman, it is probably too early to make a real judgment of the effect of many projects and programs imple-

mented in the Appalachia region. My observation is that if it has a weakness its greatest weakness is that it may lack overall economic planning and coordination and may be instead treating only symptoms and not causes of low incomes.

We might validly ask what our alternatives are toward regions in need of economic development. Some are familiar because we have tried them; others are daring and harder to envision.

Our first choice is to actually hinder the region. We can do this by actually working against the region or by working in a favorable and discriminatory way for other regions. Historically, we have done this by our expenditure of funds for national defense and research. Today, we are seeing the problem this has created for us. Some of the problems in urban centers today stem from the hope people have placed in real and imaginary opportunities. People have left rural America and migrated to the city. Today, the city is everything but the dream it has been portrayed to be. If this urban problem is to be controlled, we must return opportunities and people to the rural areas.

Our second alternative is to ignore the region. This has been our traditional approach and one which some here would like to see continued. To continue this policy is to ignore the problem of both the people in the rural area and the populated area.

The third approach we might take is that of subsidizing the region. Appalachia is partially a story of subsidization. We have expanded welfare, we have constructed public works, but to me it is still lacking in overall regional coordination to meet the problems causing the low income.

A fourth procedure would be to relocate the people of the region. I need not tell you how unpopular this idea is with the citizens or the political leaders. This would work to eliminate one part of the problem—the people would be moved to an area where opportunity was greater. Of course, the problems of the urban area would be increased as the price of solving the rural problem, and in the longrun, we will create more problems.

The fifth choice places emphasis on expansion. This advocates more jobs with the hope per capita income will benefit. For some people, this may prove to be the answer, but again the basic causes of low incomes are not attacked.

The sixth and last alternative is economic development. This, the harder approach, works for the development of better jobs. Not just more jobs, but better jobs. These jobs produce a higher per capita income because potentials are identified and met.

The challenge to the new regions being formed under the authority of the Economic Development Act is to change the system. We must see that it is a system actually capable of eliminating, or significantly reducing, the causes of low per capita incomes. The solutions to these root causes are found in the regions and not in Washington. I feel these changes are effectively promoted by title II of S. 602 and that is why I support it strongly.

I can only speak of my experiences in the Ozarks region. But, I am sure these experiences are much like those of my colleagues in other areas.

In Arkansas, the local people have started to work on identifying the needs required to solve the basic causes of the low incomes. They are not looking for welfare. Our local communities, counties, and State government, through the coordination of the Governor are working to help apply the solutions that are planned. When we do identify our needs in coordination with the needs of adjoining counties of other States in our depressed Ozark region we will be ready to join forces with the Federal Government.

This is the logical reason, it appears to me, that we need our overall plan to be presented to one executive position at the Federal level—so that the program as a total approach, not piecemeal, may be evaluated and coordinated with all of the executive departments involved. Admittedly, in finding a solution our region and others will be calling upon the operating agencies of the Federal Government for technical evaluation as they develop. At this moment the new regions are not as immediately concerned with the problem of agency coordination because their funding in this bill is for technical assistance, planning, and supplemental grants in aid, which will be under the control of the Secretary of Commerce. However when regional planning develops programs that justify expenditures in addition to these supplemental grants in aid the regional commissions should be operating on the same footing as the Appalachian Commission.

Any discussion about Federal coordination requires attention be directed toward the cost of the program. In this case, Mr. Chairman, we must look at two costs. The cost of acting and the cost of not acting.

In the part of Arkansas that is included in the Ozarks region, the local, State, and Federal governments were cheated of \$344 million in tax revenues last year. These levels of government would have had this much additional revenue had the people of this small area enjoyed the average national income.

To coordinate the Federal portion of an effective regional development program in fiscal year 1968, it will cost \$7.5 million per regional commission and in 1969, it would cost around \$12.5 million. I feel this is a reasonable amount to start a program that may be regional in its geographic concept but must be considered national in its economic implications for the future.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my unqualified support to this bill.

The program carried out by the Appalachian Regional Commission has had a solid and constructive beginning. It is a program which represents a unique relationship between the Federal and State Governments, and has proven itself a useful and effective way to do business.

It should, in my judgment, be considered a precedent for the handling of other Federal programs. The Governors have their say; the Federal cochairman appointed by the President has his say; and out of this joint process have come wise and prudent decisions on the expenditure of Appalachian Act funds.

I hope I may recall to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the birth of this bill in the Congress. At the time, the Governors of the several States appeared before the committee to testify. Our own Governor, the distinguished William W. Scranton, appeared not only to testify to the merits of this whole concept, but more particularly to request that there be added to the Appalachian Act the mine restoration section which deals specifically with assistance to those communities which find themselves facing a serious problem by reason of underground mine fires and mine subsidences. I have seen that program working in my own district, and I assure you that this is a program of immense value, in terms both of human life and of property.

The northern section of the anthracite region in Pennsylvania terminates in my congressional district. The principal city in the area is the city of Scranton. Out of this region has come, for a century, millions of dollars' worth of anthracite coal, which not only fueled the homes and industries of America, but which also created a major industry in the area in which it was mined.

Unfortunately, the story has another side. The very process of mining left behind the threat of subsidences in the terrain over the mines. The residue of mining left behind the possibility of fire breaking out in abandoned areas. We have faced both of these problems in my district. And we have faced them with great success precisely because of the assistance given through the Appalachian Act.

We have built a whole new economy in the area that once depended for its existence on the anthracite mining industry. Where once we had unemployment, we have built a new prosperity in the diversity of industries which have come to our area.

And these industries started to come long before our public institutions focused their attentions on the problems of unemployment. In the city of Scranton the concept of self-help through industrial development was born and blossomed. Countless millions of dollars voluntarily given by people from all walks of life permitted us to begin our own attack on the problem of unemployment and we are succeeding. New industrial giants like the Radio Corp. of America, Litton Industries, and the American Can Co. have joined the list of corporate citizens who have long made this area their home.

But we have other problems—difficult problems—problems that are beyond the scope of local resources which this act permits us to conquer. I am sure that most of my colleagues in the House are not readily familiar with the problems which can be created by an underground mine fire or an underground mine subsidence. They can be exceedingly difficult if the proper tools are not available.

Many years ago a mine subsidence or mine fire represented a critical threat to the future of the community where it occurred. Today these problems are solvable because we have the machinery to deal with them quickly and effectively, and that machinery is the bill which we consider today.

Let me give you two examples:

Recently two mine fires burning underground were discovered within my district. Potentially they contained the seeds to destroy the industrial base which the people of my area have fought for 20 years to build. Potentially they contained the seeds to destroy the homes of people who had spent a lifetime paying for them. But, thanks to the machinery of this bill, thanks to the expertise of people who have developed a new technology to deal with the horrible problem of an underground mine fire, we are able to deal with them with quiet confidence.

Take away this act, take away the muscle that is its authorization, take away the expertise that has developed this technology, and you will have destroyed one of the most enlightened and important steps we have taken in the 5 years that I have been a Member of this body.

In short, Mr. Chairman, there are literally hundreds of thousands of people in my own congressional district alone for whom the Appalachian Act has been the beginning of an era instead of the end.

I wish, at this time, to address myself particularly to a section in the bill which would permit the States and/or local units of government to include the cost of acquiring land as part, or all, of their 25-percent matching funds on strip-mine reclamation projects. According to a study by the Department of Interior, only 4 percent of the strip mine areas in Appalachia are owned by public bodies. Because of the present restrictions in the Appalachia Act, prohibiting the expenditure of funds on lands not in public ownership, few projects have developed in the strip mine areas. This section, permitting local or State units of government to acquire these lands as part of their contributions, would be a significant step to the further development of our region.

Mr. Chairman, I have long believed that that government is best which is closest to the people. Through the Appalachian Act, we have seen the Federal Government move closer to the people through the partnership which has come about with the governments of the States. I have observed no attempt on the part of the administrators of this program to make this a political program. We have had two successive Republican administrations in Pennsylvania. The first, in the person of Governor Scranton, helped shape the bill. The second, in the person of Governor Shafer, heartily endorses it.

I hope there will be no funds cut from this bill. It is doing a vital job and is doing it well, not only in the area of mine restoration, but in the construction of essential roads, and in other projects which are needed in the Appalachian region.

The work we have done in rebuilding our area into an area of industrial dis-

tinction has been hailed as a miracle all across the United States. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we intend to go further on the path of distinction, and I assure you equally that this bill is a vital tool for us to use along the way.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the endorsement of this House today for S. 602, which extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, for another 2 years. I especially urge the approval of section 211 of this act—providing funds for vocational education—at the authorization level that was recommended by the Committee on Public Works.

I wish to commend the Appalachian Regional Commission for the spirit of bipartisanship which has dominated its work during the 2 years that it has been in existence.

I think that the Commission has done an admirable job of administering the Appalachian program. At no time has there been any evidence of partisan influence on the operation and administration of the program. This, I believe, is a real tribute to the members of the Commission, representatives of the Federal Government, and the 12 Appalachian States.

In the past, most people in the Appalachian region have earned their income from one of three major activities—coal mining, heavy industry, and farming. Nationally, employment in these occupations has declined over the past quarter century, but the effects in the Appalachian region have been particularly severe.

Additionally, thousands of young Appalachians enter the labor force each year. It is essential that they meet the world of work possessing some occupational skills, lest they jump from school rolls to welfare rolls without ever holding a job.

The answer to this dilemma is vocational education. Section 211 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 authorized \$16 million for construction of new vocational education centers—either in conjunction with high schools or separately—and for purchases of equipment for these new schools. The full authorization was appropriated and, by the end of fiscal year 1967, virtually every penny has been used.

Vocational training is indisputably one of the most essential ingredients in the development and improvement of the Appalachian region. The Appalachian States have all recognized the importance of providing vocational training to the greatest possible number of people who can profit from it. In fact, the vocational education program has been one of the most successful and most popular of the various programs under the Appalachian Act.

Appalachia's most valuable asset is its people. But the region has not used its people wisely. To often, they have been ignored and neglected. They have been allowed to go without jobs, usually because they do not possess the skills which are necessary to perform today's jobs. That is why there are hundreds of thousands of Appalachian people who are

forced to subsist on welfare and who have lost all hope of working.

That is also why millions of Appalachian people have left the region and gone to the big cities where they hope to find work. Massive migration to the cities has been no solution. It has only compounded the national problem of what to do about the hordes of unskilled who have crowded into the cities.

The way to alleviate the plight of the unemployed in Appalachia is contained in the vocational education program which we are now considering. This program will take the high school dropout and the poorly trained adult and equip him to perform a worthwhile job. These jobs can be found and they can be found in Appalachia. Some of these jobs are going begging right now in Kentucky and West Virginia and elsewhere in the region because there are not enough people who are trained to fill them. But, unless these people get the training that they so desperately need, they will only linger as statistics on the unemployment rolls and the welfare rolls of Appalachia—or perhaps Chicago and Detroit and other big cities.

The House Public Works Committee—at the suggestion of the Appalachian Regional Commission—set the authorization for vocational education projects for the next 2 years at \$26 million, or \$10 million more than the 1967-68 period. The Appalachian Commission indicates that current estimates for vocational education facilities could use \$40 million in Federal funds in fiscal year 1968. Approximately \$20.5 million will be available to the Appalachian region in fiscal year 1968 under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The rapid pace of vocational school construction in the region has placed an increasing burden on these funds for operations. Even with an additional \$13 million in fiscal year 1968—half of the Commission's biennial request—Federal funds will fall considerably short of the level which could be effectively utilized.

These statistics make clear that the \$26 million authorization for Appalachian vocational education facilities in the next 2 years is a justifiable and desirable investment.

Mr. DENNEY. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It is never a pleasure to oppose the ranking member of the minority, because there is no one in the House of Representatives for whom I have greater respect and admiration. His sincerity certainly is unquestionable.

Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the remarks of my colleagues who call this legislation favoritism. In the make-up of our country we have had and always will have an unequal distribution of Federal funds for certain Federal programs. This bill does favor my area of Appalachia. However, the people of my area also believe that other areas of this country are favored by other Federal programs.

For example, the total expenditures of Federal aid for highway construction in our State of Tennessee is \$28.16 per capita, but we are not complaining be-

cause Nevada received \$95.53 per person, Alaska received \$199.79 per person, Montana \$84.04, Wyoming \$146.49 per person, and a great number of other non-Appalachian States receive as much as 100 percent more than does our State, and other Appalachian States surrounding our State.

We are not also complaining because Florida, Alaska, California, Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Iowa, and 20 other States, receive a considerable amount more Federal funds per capita for public assistance than does my State and other States in my area.

We have heard much about agriculture conservation, and I understand there will be an amendment to delete any work for agriculture conservation, or any conservation in Appalachia.

The Members may be interested in knowing about and hearing these figures, and I will ask them how they sound when we talk about favoritism. Would the Members believe that the per-capita expenditure for the program in agriculture conservation is \$165.98 in North Dakota, \$112.79 in Nebraska, \$101.29 in South Dakota, \$86.58 in Kansas, \$75.85 in Iowa, while at the same time in these five States in my Appalachian area these figures read as follows: Alabama \$9.93, Georgia \$10.87, Virginia \$4.18, Tennessee \$9.96, and Kentucky \$13.31.

We also find from these figures—and I received these figures from the Library of Congress—that in these same States that we call the "prosperous States" they receive more Federal funds per capita for education than do most of the States in the Appalachian program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say let us be fair when we talk of favoritism.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act for a period of 2 years.

When the Appalachian bill was considered by Congress in 1965, it was understood that this special, remedial program, to deal with the chronic economic problems of the Appalachian region, would have a 6-year life. The highway portion of the program was authorized for 6 years in recognition of the fact that such a major construction program could not be accomplished in a shorter term. The Appalachian Regional Commission was chartered for a 6-year period to administer the program.

Other sections of the act were authorized for only 2 years to give the Congress an opportunity to examine the program after 2 years of operation and to determine what, if any, modifications should be made in it. The bill before us would authorize for an additional 2 years programs to improve the public facilities of the region, with particular interest on health and education, programs to deal with the legacy of mining which afflicts so much of the region, programs for land conservation and for utilization of the region's water resources.

There is little question that 2 years

experience with the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 leads to the conclusion that this House was correct in its initial judgment to establish the program. The minority views, in fact, filed by several of my colleagues on the House Public Works Committee contain no criticism of the administration of the program by the Appalachian Regional Commission and, indeed, make the point that all evidence presented to the committee points to the fact that the program has been "honestly and conscientiously administered."

There has been a good deal of talk, off and on, over the past several years about States rights, about States prerogatives, and about how the Federal Government has usurped almost all of them.

There is also talk of an attempt to reverse this trend, of revenue sharing with the States, block grants to the States and a general restoration, within our Federal system, of State sovereignty.

I submit that the bill before us today is one of the best things this House has seen for doing just that, for recognizing and restoring the responsibility of State government.

The way it works is that the States in league with their local communities decide their own needs and their priorities for the use of Appalachian Act funds, and then justify them to their sister States and the Federal Government. This process requires the Governors of these States, as the officials most intimately concerned, to make the fundamental decisions on the investment of funds.

Each and every specific project is born in and of the States. Local communities, working with the State governments, form and shape the programs which the States then submit to the Commission.

If, for example, a State decides its needs lie in the field of vocational education, it then makes the commitment to invest available Appalachian funds to fill this need. More and more States, incidentally, are finding that vocational education is a key to economic advancement.

Vocational education helps to meet two of the region's greatest needs: upgrading the skills of the unemployed and providing skills to those about to enter the labor force. One of Appalachia's deepest seated problems has been lack of skilled people who can neither find productive work nor keep up with the rapid technological changes which make the old skills obsolete.

I am pleased, for that reason, that our committee has seen fit to increase the authorization for vocational education for the next 2 years from \$18 to \$26 million. In the first 2 years of the program, nearly \$16 million has been obligated to build some 70 such schools. I hope a lot more will be built in the next 2 years.

At the same time I would note that the committee has made a considerable reduction in the authorizations that were recommended by the other body. This reduction amounts to over \$53 million.

The point here is not so much the amount of money to be spent nor for what purpose it is to be spent. The point I am trying to make is that in my State of Ohio and all the other States the people and their Governors decide the

things needed to give Appalachia economic equity. They are not told in any instance by the Federal Government what is best for them. They decide in their own interest what is best for them.

It seems to me that this is the way a lot of us would like to see things operate. We keep talking about the role of the States and their better qualifications for deciding their own best interests. Today, gentlemen, we are being asked quite frankly to put our money where our mouth is.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I merely wish to compliment the gentleman for a very fine statement, and I think a statement that is consistent on the point of the role of the States in connection with our resource development and the development of our human resources. I think the gentleman has stated very correctly the great strength of this Regional Commission approach as we have been following it. We have relied very heavily upon the States for initiative and decision in connection with this program. I think that is the secret of its success and its popularity at the grass roots in the States. That is why it is so inconceivable to me that some of the very outspoken champions of States rights in this body apparently have abandoned this principle insofar as this program is concerned.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

It was stated earlier that the intent of the Appalachian highway program has been violated by the application of funds on routes where some kinds of roads now exist. This gives a total false impression of what this program is about and why it was enacted.

It is true that this program is to "open up new areas"; it is not only to make those cities and towns, where employment exists, accessible to people who live in the Appalachian region, but also to open up the Appalachian areas to stimulate new investment in those areas to encourage travel and tourism therein.

Many of the corridors designated by the Appalachian program for the receipt of these funds are now traversed by a road because there are few avenues of passage through these mountains. These roads are circuitous and often dangerous. They are not, in many cases, capable of handling heavy commercial traffic or making these areas attractive for new plant location and the development of new jobs. Straightening out and rebuilding these roads to provide a regional system of highways is essential to the growth of the region.

It should be noted that even dealing with corridors where existing right-of-way is used and, in some cases, even existing pavement, the estimated cost of providing adequate highways in the designated system is close to \$2.2 billion. The Appalachian Commission, with the States concurring, voted to live with what was authorized for the original system—\$840 million—and the bill before us does not provide for any general increase. This was done because of an awareness for the need for economy and

careful use of these funds. If totally new locations were used, the cost would be astronomical.

My colleague from Ohio earlier referred to Route 50 as being a poor choice for an Appalachian corridor because it went to Cincinnati. Route 50 is a key link in the Appalachian system, traversing the central area of the region where unemployment has been a major problem. It provides an east-west route from Cincinnati to the Baltimore-Washington area, through the heart of Appalachia—southern Ohio and West Virginia. The commerce it will generate through this area will return many times over its cost. Other routes serve other key population centers such as the corridor from Columbus, south to Asheville, N.C.

An adequate highway system in this day and age is a prerequisite to economic progress.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. The highway goes the other way from Cincinnati also, does it not?

Mr. HARSHA. Highway 50?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes.

Mr. HARSHA. I think it probably does.

Mr. OLSEN. The implication was that it went to Cincinnati. I just wanted to know if it went the other way, too.

Mr. HARSHA. I think it does.

Mr. OLSEN. It traverses several counties that need this highway. Is that not correct?

Mr. HARSHA. I do not think the Appalachian portion of it extends beyond there.

Mr. OLSEN. But there are several counties?

Mr. HARSHA. It goes clear across the country, but it is a key link to the Appalachian system. It provides an East-West link.

There has been a lot said about the pending bill amending the original act to provide for the appropriation of all Appalachian Act program funds to the President.

It is true this procedure is in contrast to the present law under which appropriations are made to the several departments of the Federal Government, having responsibilities under the act. However this change has been suggested to permit consolidation of the program for budgetary purposes and permit flexibility in the use of Appalachian Act appropriations.

To my mind, the essential reason for this change—and its primary justification—is that it manifests a vote of confidence in the Appalachian Regional Commission and the conception of Federal-State partnership which it involves. Appropriation of funds to the President is a further means of emphasizing the prerogatives and roles of the States in the planning of these funds. It permits the Appalachian Governors to deal with confidence with the Federal cochairman of the Commission, the President's representative, and to participate in the key decisions regarding where limited funds can best be used within the framework of the program.

This change emphasizes the independ-

ence of the Appalachian Regional Commission which is so rare a creature that we should give it every possible chance for complete success.

The line agencies responsible for the basic program areas in which the Commission operates would not be shut out because there is provision in this bill that all their standards and criteria be met and their opinions and recommendations, rules, and regulations be honored.

This is a gesture of belief that we know what we are talking about when we say the several States should be an equal partner in the federal system.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman this legislation is the product of bipartisan contributions and consideration. Many amendments recommended by the minority were adopted. The minority in their report maintain that the program is being honestly and conscientiously administered. With such a commendation it would seem quite reasonable to ask this body to extend this program for another 2 years. A truly impressive beginning has been made and the promise this program holds for the future is such that continuation of it is unquestionably in the national interest. We are trying to preserve the resources of this Nation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I am giving strong support to this legislation. The Appalachian program is an historic landmark in State-Federal relationships. It is one of the Nation's best examples of success through teamwork by Federal, State, and local units of government. This is the best administered program which I have seen since coming to Washington.

It was the Appalachian Governors who first urged an interstate approach to the problems of the region and who originated the Appalachian program. A remarkable degree of cooperation between the Federal Government and the Governors has marked the work of the Appalachian Commission from the very beginning. The Appalachian program is bringing new hope to the 18 million people who live in the hills and mountains of Appalachia.

The strength of this program, in part, lies in its adaptability from State to State, each State using it to solve its own problems and to meet its own needs. It has permitted national goals to be translated into workable programs to meet local needs. This program is making possible the construction of vitally needed highways, health and vocational facilities, sewage treatment plants and other community facilities.

The Appalachian program is, in my opinion, the most important piece of legislation for the people of western North Carolina that has been enacted since I became a Member of Congress.

This is a program to rebuild and revitalize the economy of the entire Appalachian area. The highway building proposals in the Appalachian bill, coupled with its other features, promise relief to an area which has suffered eco-

nomically because of an inadequate highway system.

The rugged geography of the Appalachian region creates tremendous transportation problems and much higher construction costs.

Appalachia is an underdeveloped region with vast untapped human and physical resources. In most sections of the Appalachian Mountains, as in my area, the people have been active in trying to solve their own problems. They have been resourceful, self-reliant, and courageous. They have worked hard and accomplished much.

Since 1948, Western North Carolina Associated Communities has been an active organization promoting regional development. This organization founded the Western North Carolina Regional Planning Commission which, with the aid of a professional planning agency, made an economic analysis of the area and outlined a development program. The development report stated that the key to the development of western North Carolina is roads and highways, and I know that the same applies to other sections of Appalachia.

I am strongly supporting S. 602. It offers continued hope and economic uplift to a section of our Nation. But I will confine my remarks in the main to the importance of the highway construction and the vocational education provisions of the bill.

Isolation is the prime problem of Appalachia. Highway and rail builders usually found it easier to bypass this mountainous region than to traverse it.

Civilization moves with transportation and transportation has been an important factor in the development of each section of our great country. The Appalachian region lies close to great concentrations of people and wealth, but isolation caused by inadequate highways and transportation facilities has prevented the extension of such growth and economic prosperity into the Appalachian Mountains.

Highways are needed to ease traffic congestion in some places and are needed as an instrument of economic development throughout the Appalachian area.

By opening the door to transportation, we lay the foundation for private enterprise to come in to build and develop wealth and jobs. The area is rich in climate, in water, and timber resources, and in human resources. Make the area accessible with modern highways and these resources will bring about its development along industrial and recreational lines and will convert it into a land of promise.

I am proud to report that practically all of the Appalachian corridor highways approved for western North Carolina are in some stage of development—either in the engineering, right-of-way acquisition, contract letting, or construction stage. The first link of Appalachian corridor highway was completed and dedicated last fall near Asheville, N.C. This new highway system is breaking down the isolation caused by North Carolina mountains so as to permit the area to engage more fully in interstate and international commerce. The construc-

tion of access roads under this program will increase job opportunities for the people.

The new roads and prospects of new roads are already causing new industries to locate in the region and present industries to expand. The new roads planned are already becoming an important factor in the expansion of the area's tourist business.

The vocational training and manpower training features of the program have done much to promote development of technical and vocational training facilities in western North Carolina. As the doors open to vocational training we do much to reduce unemployment, create job opportunities, and to make workers employable by providing new skills. This vocational training development benefits every businessman and every service establishment by increasing the earning ability and per capita income of our citizens. Such training is a safeguard against the effects of automation in this age of science and technology. It provides that our most valuable natural resource, the brains and muscles and ingenuity of our people, can be most effectively utilized.

The Appalachian program is promoting local, State, and Federal cooperation in meeting the economic needs of an important section of our Nation. It is encouraging people to help themselves. It deserves the continued support of Congress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a bill which attempts to go to the heart of the problems faced in the Appalachian areas of our Nation.

This bill is based on the concept that several States, working together, can be better armed to fight economic problems in unison than separately. Since economic problems do not stop at State lines, it is imperative that we approach their solution on a regional basis.

The States solicit the help of the Federal Government in areas such as unemployment, lack of adequate educational facilities, and economic isolation due to lack of good transportation facilities. This idea and this approach have been eminently successful. They should be continued.

Representing many shades of opinion, many philosophies, and many political beliefs, the States have worked remarkably well together in providing a common attack on the problems they face. The States in the Appalachian region have acted with respect for each other, with concern for each other's problems and in keeping with the philosophy of the program and the mandates of the law.

This concept of State equality, an integral part of the whole program, does not bog down in any Alphonse and Gastonism. The central program has direction and thrust. It can be given even more with an alteration of the appropriations procedure so that the money can go through the central authority of the Commission which has built-in safeguards of Federal supervision and regu-

lation and also can preserve sufficient flexibility.

What this program has achieved thus far is a beachhead. It has made a beginning.

Let me give a concrete example of one of the types of assistance which can be mobilized under the legislation under discussion. The two largest cities of West Virginia, Charleston and Huntington, are located 50 miles apart. Each city has a population of less than 100,000. They are joined by an interstate highway. Each city now has its own airport. Each airport is inferior by jet standards, and in 2 or 3 years when the airlines convert to jets they will not be able to land safely at either airport. But how can local communities of the size of Charleston and Huntington afford to finance a new airport?

We have been fortunate in enlisting the interest of the States of Ohio and Kentucky, our neighbors on the west, who have many passengers interested in better air service. They are willing to go over into West Virginia to obtain this service. But how do you put together a complex mechanism involving three States and crossing a number of county lines? Here is where the Appalachian Regional Development Act is coming into play. Just this morning, the Appalachian Regional Commission announced a technical assistance grant of \$12,000 to enable the start of preconstruction planning on a midway regional airport, halfway between Charleston and Huntington. This \$12,000 is drawn \$4,000 each from the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio's allocations. It is supplemented by \$8,000 in local funds from the counties of Cabell and Putnam. The Federal Aviation Administration is putting up \$20,000 to help finance this preconstruction planning.

I doubt if we could tie these numerous pieces together were it not for the Appalachian Regional Commission, which will help break the economic isolation by building a great new airport which will serve the most people at the least cost.

This is not being done by Federal administrative fiat. Yesterday, the voters of Cabell County were called on to vote their share of \$2.5 million for the building of the airport. The cynics said that Cabell County would never vote to build an airport in another county, yet they came out in recordbreaking numbers. An unprecedented 40 percent came to the polls, and they voted 86.2 percent in support of the midway airport—by a smashing vote of over 16,000 to 2,500.

This could never have been done without the assistance of the Appalachian Regional Commission, which is helping with the preconstruction planning funds, and also will help with the construction funds.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will win wide and enthusiastic support of the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I favor this legislation. The only trouble is, I do not believe it goes far enough.

I was touched by the heart-rending plea of the gentleman from Georgia, and

I echo his sentiments, when he talks about stacked up slums and ghettos.

As a matter of fact, I heard much of the debate which was going on this afternoon, and the only thing which really surprised me was that nobody, but nobody, mentioned the fact that the cities, the areas of grief, the pockets of poverty, the slums, are not at all being attacked.

It seems to me that if there is any discrimination in this legislation, it is discrimination against the cities. You hear talk of people dreaming of a better life. Do they dream of a better life only in the rural areas? Do you not think they dream of a better life in the city slums and ghettos?

You talk about the migration of people to the cities out of the rural areas. You send these people up to the cities and then you wash your hands of them. When we ask you to help us, you turn a deaf ear. Is this fair? Is this decent? Is this aid to the Nation or is this aid solely to particular little areas? When we in the cities come here for housing, you turn a deaf ear to us; but when you want funds for the farmers, well, that is fine. We have to give it to you. And we do.

Tomorrow I am going to offer an amendment to include pockets of poverty in the cities, which, I hope, will be added to this legislation. I hope I will get your support, because we need vocational schools in the cities. We have to take those people off the welfare rolls and give them jobs. Why do you suppose you have riots throughout the country? In Newark, Detroit, Watts, Harlem, and Bedford Stuyvesant? It seems to me that the crying need throughout the entire Nation is for aid to those people living in the infernos. But you ignore this cry of despair. There has not been one person on the floor today except for myself so far, who has gotten up and raised his voice on behalf of the riot-torn cities. Is this discrimination? Well, if there was ever discrimination, this certainly is it.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope you gentlemen on the committee will take into consideration the fact that there are people who need help besides the rural areas and the fact that you have to talk about other things than mountains. You have to think about people. I hope I will get the assistance of all of you gentlemen tomorrow when I offer my amendment. Thank you.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks of my colleague, who preceded me. He has raised a very important question, one which we raised before the Committee on Public Works last year. I testified on May 24, 1966, in support of a bill which I had drafted in conjunction with the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] some 4 or 5 years ago which would have made eligible for public works aid under the then existing depressed areas legislation poverty areas of 50,000 population within cities. Unfortunately, under the present law either an entire county or an entire municipality of 250,000 persons or more must meet the criteria in order to qualify for assistance under the Public Works and Economic

Development Act of 1965. This means that poverty areas within the major cities such as Cleveland, Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York are excluded and do not receive the assistance which is necessary in order to meet the problem of unemployment as it affects America; not only rural America but urban America, and it affects practically all of the districts which are represented among the 435 of us.

I have drafted an amendment which I submitted to the distinguished floor manager of the pending bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. I have advised him that I expect to offer it when the bill is open for amendment tomorrow.

My amendment is similar to my bill, H.R. 1251. It would make eligible for designation as a redevelopment area a part of a county with a population of 50,000 or more or a part of a municipality with a population of 50,000 or more.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential to reach pockets of poverty and hard-core unemployment within our cities.

In 1965 the Congress passed the Public Works and Economic Development Act. This far-reaching piece of legislation provided programs of grants and loans for public works, development facilities, commercial expansion, technical assistance and aid to planning agencies, as a means of assisting the economies of distressed areas.

Redevelopment areas for the purposes of the act are designated on the basis of median family income or unemployment levels. As I pointed out, in order to qualify for assistance on the basis of these criteria, a municipality of 250,000 persons or more is treated as a whole. Because of this statutory definition of a redevelopment area, some of the most needy urban areas, which would otherwise qualify, have been excluded from assistance. This stems from considering unemployment rates for entire municipalities, regardless of the disparity within them.

Many urban areas whose extremely high unemployment has made them riot-prone nevertheless are excluded from assistance because the city in which they are located taken as a whole does not qualify. This quirk in the act affects the Watts area of Los Angeles, western Detroit, the Hough district of Cleveland, and Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and south Bronx in New York.

My proposal would not only permit the inclusion of needy areas whose accidental geographical association with more affluent areas now excludes them, but it would also rationalize the converse situation where an entire larger area has been pushed over the margin by the existence of a badly depressed area within it. If for example, the unemployment rate in central Cleveland were to rise slightly, all of Cleveland, including the prosperous areas, would then be eligible.

In testifying on my bill last year, Eugene P. Foley, then Director of the Economic Development Administration, stated that his agency was "aware of and sympathetic with the plight of these isolated and impoverished urban areas."

Unfortunately, more than a year later the situation in the cities has worsened.

If one wants an ironic example of how the present criteria operate, he need only look at Cleveland, where a slight improvement in the overall employment picture last year disqualified the Hough area, which has the highest unemployment in the Nation. This took place two weeks before the Hough riots.

By pinpointing the areas of greatest need, we will insure that the aid will go where it is most sorely required, and that qualification will not be dependent on the economic health of an entire geographical unit.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment discussed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] and support of my proposed amendment, both of which are designed to reach this particular problem. It is my opinion that we cannot wait any longer. A year has now gone by without any action by the Committee on Public Works. We have had the summer of 1967 and we have had Newark and Detroit. One of the basic causes of this civil disorder, of course, is unemployment. One of the basic reasons is lack of job training and lack of job opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this problem be met now and not be postponed any longer.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the colloquy which has been held relating to this proposed amendment. However, I feel that there are several aspects pertaining thereto which I would like to mention. I think this proposed amendment is the best evidence of the Pandora's box that is being opened by the inclusion in this bill of title II, relating to EDA.

If title II had not been brought into the actual consideration of this measure as an unrelated matter, this issue would not be before the House at this moment, an issue on which the Congress of the United States does not claim to have an answer at the moment. It is a matter which is now under study. It is a matter on which, if one takes the approach being proposed, means the adoption of the continuation of programs that have proven to be failures, and very new programs which would be added to the EDA, which would take over the present programs and add to them, with bonus money.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that anyone could feel with proper justification that by adding some of these 50,000 persons in poor areas it would substantially solve the problem, a problem which we cannot solve today with the basic programs which are now in existence. We cannot solve many of these problems with money. We cannot solve many of them with so-called demonstration cities programs. We cannot solve them with urban renewal programs. We cannot solve them with the variously proposed housing programs. We cannot solve them with public housing. And further, we cannot solve them with millions more in the OEO program as well as adding anything and everything to the EDA program.

Mr. Chairman, the only answer is that

we would be giving a little more money to the present program, and this entire Pandora's box is opened up, I feel, unwisely.

So, if this decision could be met by an amendment at the present time, it has not been adequately considered; there is nothing magic about the figure of 50,000 persons; it has to be considered with relation to all of the present and planned new programs.

Mr. Chairman, by just placing another layer on the cake of the present pro-

grams is not the answer. However, the main point here today is the fact that this Pandora's box is opened because they choose to use the EDA approach as a rider when, in fact, we should be talking about Appalachia.

Mr. Chairman, as we are about to finish general debate on this matter, I think it wise that all Members have an accurate idea of the various financial matters relating to the Appalachian program. Tomorrow, we will begin the consideration of amendments to S. 602, as

reported. Some of these amendments will concern authorizations for appropriations. So that all Members can intelligently discuss the amendments to be offered tomorrow, I will request, when we go into the House, unanimous consent to include a financial analysis of the Appalachian regional development program.

The following table shows the financial analysis of the Appalachian region development program and the effect of S. 602:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965 (PUBLIC LAW 89-4)

[Financial analysis, in millions of dollars]

Section	Program	Department	27-month authoriza- tion	Appropriations								Com- mitted as of June 30, 1967	Carry- over	Un- appor- tioned authori- zation	S. 602 authori- zation	S. 602 plus or minus carry- over	Budget request, fiscal year 1968
				Fiscal years 1965 and 1966 (15 months)				Fiscal year 1967			Total Appro- pria- tion						
				Re- quest	Appro- pria- tion	Com- mit- ment	Carry- over	Re- quest	Appro- pria- tion	Avail- able							
105	Administrative expenses.....	ARC.....	\$ 2.40	1.30	1.29	1.29	0	1.11	1.10	1.10	2.39	2.39	0	0.01	1.70	1.70	0.785
202b	Health facilities.....	HEW.....	41.00	21.00	21.00	0	21.00	2.50	2.50	23.50	23.50	0	23.50	45.50	50.00	73.50	15.00
202c	Health operations.....	HEW.....	\$ 28.00														
203	Soil conservation.....	Agriculture.....	17.00	8.50	7.00	6.38	.62	4.38	3.00	3.62	10.00	10.00	0	7.00	19.00	19.00	3.00
204	Timber development.....	do.....	5.00	1.35	1.00	0	1.00	.50	0	1.00	1.00	.75	.25	4.00	1.00	1.25	0
205	Mineral resources.....	Interior.....			16.00	10.77	5.23	10.57	7.00	12.23	23.00	20.90	3.95	11.65	30.00	33.95	.80
	Fish and wildlife.....	do.....	36.50	18.00	1.35	0	1.35	1.35	.50	1.85	1.85	0	0	2.00	2.00	2.00	.40
206	Water resources.....	Corps of Engineers.....	5.00	1.70	1.50	1.23	.27	1.80	1.50	1.77	3.00	3.00	0	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
207	Housing.....	HUD.....													5.00	5.00	0
211	Vocational education.....	HEW.....	16.00	8.00	8.00	3.42	4.58	8.00	8.00	12.58	16.00	15.99	.01	0	26.00	26.01	7.00
212	Sewerage treatment.....	Interior.....	6.00	3.00	3.00	1.56	1.44	3.00	3.00	4.44	6.00	5.00	1.00	0	6.00	7.00	3.00
214	Support grants.....	Commerce.....	90.00	45.00	45.00	18.19	26.81	35.00	30.00	56.81	75.00	64.00	11.00	15.00	71.00	82.00	30.00
215	Culture.....	A. & H.....															0
302	Res. LDD.....	Commerce.....	New 5.50	3.00	2.50	1.60	.90	3.00	2.75	3.65	5.25	3.02	2.23	.25	10.00	12.23	3.00
401	Total, exclusive of highways.....		252.40	110.85	107.64	\$ 44.42	\$ 63.22	\$ 71.20	59.35	\$ 122.57	166.99	125.05	41.94	\$ 85.41	\$ 220.00	\$ 261.94	\$ 64.20
201	Highway systems.....	Commerce.....	\$ 805.00	200.00	200.00	176.55	9.22	130.00	100.00	109.22	300.00	171.00	129.00	540.00	715.00	844.00	100.00
	Access roads.....	do.....	\$ 35.00			14.23											
	Total.....		1,092.40	310.85	307.64	235.20	72.44	201.20	159.35	231.79	466.99	296.05	170.94	625.41	936.70	1,107.64	164.985

\$2,200,000 from sec. 105 plus \$200,000 from sec. 401.

Not to be appropriated or needed until construction facilities are completed under sec. 202b.

Transferred from HEW to Interior per Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966, effective date May 10, 1966.

Totals do not agree due to rounding of figures.

Does not include sec. 105 which under S. 602 would be only funds not authorized to be appropriated to the President.

6-year authorization.

Authorization of sec. 201 is \$840,000,000. Appalachian Regional Commission apportioned funds as shown.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY].

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late. I know many of the Members are tired of sitting here. I am confronted with a situation that I heard an eminent jurist once make when he said "the hour of decision is a lonely one."

To my mind the hour of decision on this bill is a lonely one, because each and every one of us are going to have to decide whether this bill is proper, whether it is the best that this House of Representatives can produce.

Ladies and gentlemen, I sat and listened to 97 witnesses. I made a trip with our esteemed subcommittee chairman who, I want to say at this point in the RECORD, is one of the finest men I have ever met in my life. He showed me every courtesy throughout these hearings. As a freshman in the House, he allowed me to delve into the witnesses and ask the questions I wanted, but I have some reservations, ladies and gentlemen, about this bill for this reason: I come from the midwestern area, from Nebraska. There we believe that a man can go just so high if he develops a self-help, if he develops a desire, and an initiative to proceed to lift himself up.

I am concerned about some of the amendments in this bill. For example,

the appropriation of the funds directly to the President. Of all things, if this bill is as good as the proponents have said, why is it that it must be changed? Why not leave it in the hands where it was, and let it continue to work, as they say, in such a remarkable manner. I believe the President has all he can do at the present time with the problems he is faced with, both domestic and in foreign affairs.

I am concerned about the expansion of Appalachia so that it is gradually expanding throughout the United States.

If the Members will take a map—and I have one here—and if they will draw a line from Madison, Wis., directly south, they will see that with the proposed 20 counties in Mississippi they have covered approximately 40 percent of the United States. It is gradually going on and on and on. This was not the original concept.

As I read the original report, there were seven States that the President investigated through a regional commission. That was the idea of Appalachia. We will now have 12 States. We have one more county in New York, two more in Alabama, one in Tennessee, and 20 in Mississippi. How much farther shall we go? When the regional commission reported it said Appalachia because it had

the bold upthrust of land that it was a region separate and apart, it did not have good access, and the people in that area needed help. Yet in 18 of those 20 counties in Mississippi the highest elevation is 806 feet above mean sea level. Is that a bold upthrust of land?

Mr. Chairman, to my mind this is just an open door to try and get more.

I am seriously considering, if this bill passes, drafting a bill at the next session and introducing it to ask for a midwestern regional development area out in the Great Plains area. Why not? What is wrong with it?

Also, I am concerned with the fact that we have these two bills together. For example, Appalachia was conceived and made into law March 9, 1965. EDA was made into law on August 26, 1965. Two separate bills. Yet here today in 1967 we are faced with one, and I believe the distinguished gentleman from Florida hit it right on the head when he said there is a reason for it. Everybody who believes they can qualify under UDA will vote for this bill, so that they will not kill the EDA provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to spend just a few minutes—and this is where the hour of decisions is lonely, again—I have discussed with Members throughout the House of Representatives that I have the opinion that title I of this bill

is unconstitutional, and I have been told, "Well, that was all taken up in 1965, that was discussed."

Then I have had it said to me that the Attorney General of the United States at that time ruled that it was constitutional. Well, several of you are lawyers in this room, and the Attorney General puts on his trousers just like you and I do—one at a time—and his opinion is no better than his research and the research that his staff does. But I would like to call your attention to a different approach than the approach that was argued back in 1965.

On page 92 of the report accompanying this bill, this briefly outlines my thinking as to why I believe the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 and title I of this bill is unconstitutional, although it is not unconstitutional per se as to the Federal Government. Let me say right here, ladies and gentlemen, I thought that the gentleman from Georgia did an outstanding job of appealing to the emotions of all of us here in this room.

I was down in Appalachia. I saw little kids in threadbare rags. I saw mud 3 feet high in houses. There is no question but what my heart goes out to these people. But the point is that we are still a government of laws and not of men. Are we going to conform to the rules and regulations that have made this country great? Or are we going to say that because there are certain areas in our country that need some help that we are going to feed in Federal funds?

Right at this point, I want to say because of the operation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment which provides that all States must treat their citizens equally, that there is only one State under title I of this law that qualifies, and that is the State of West Virginia, because every single county in West Virginia is in Appalachia.

Look at the State of New York. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBER] has brought out that the city of New York and its residents must pay taxes to help to keep Appalachia rolling to the tune of millions of dollars—920 million and some odd dollars in this next year.

How can each one of you go back to your constituents—you in California and to Kansas, and to my State of Nebraska, and all over the country and say, "Yes, we made a special law for people in an area which is gradually eroding—but just be patient and we will get out to the Midwest and out to the west coast eventually."

The Appalachian Regional Commission under section 1(a) has one member for each participating State.

Under section 102 the Commission develops plans and determines the priorities and since the States involved have only a portion of their counties in the program, the State contribution comes from revenues extracted from all of the counties—this would constitute discrimination against the counties not in the Appalachia program.

I would like to call attention to section 211 of the 1965 act which authorizes \$16 million in grants for the construction of vocational education facilities in

the region. These funds are in addition to sums provided to the Appalachian States under the Vocational and Education Act of 1963.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of my colleagues who have any legal experience are acquainted with the case of Brown against the Board of Education of Topeka, a landmark case, wherein it was held that:

Today education is perhaps the most important function of our State and local governments.

In these days it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

In the same case on page 692, the court said:

We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place.

Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs are deprived of equal treatment of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can see no difference between racial discrimination and geographical discrimination.

Here you would have a State providing separate and additional educational or vocational facilities in one part of the State and not in another. This, to me, seems likewise inherently unequal.

Section 202 of the 1965 act, in the demonstration health project authorizes \$41 million for constructing and equipping health facilities and \$28 million for their operation.

S. 602 would authorize additional funds to be used for training personnel or for possible deficits.

This is again a matching-funds project. The Court held in the case of Beal against Holcombe that it is the individual who is entitled to equal protection of the laws, and if he is denied a facility or a convenience which under substantially the same circumstances is furnished to another, he may properly complain that his constitutional privilege has been invaded. In terms of a local government offering a facility to its citizens, I believe the reason is even more compelling to make health facilities available to all citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I have the idea—and there will be a motion to strike title I—that title I is unconstitutional. I think title II is constitutional because it sets up a formula that provides equal treatment to all citizens of a class throughout the United States. I think definitely that the Appalachian region could qualify under title II. Why is it necessary to have a separate bureaucracy appropriate different money and continue to proliferate these Federal programs?

It is high time for Congress to take a stand and say to the American people who are paying the tax bill, "Look, we are going to cut down on some of this. We have a good program that is working. We will fit these programs together. We will consolidate them, and we will get more of a tax dollar value out of your money that is being sent to Washington."

I definitely believe that title I is unconstitutional. I ask you all to carefully consider how it does discriminate against the citizens of States that are involved in this program. Those citizens who are not in the Appalachian region are likewise being discriminated against. This is a different approach than was made 2 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes, the remainder of my time, to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, as we come to the conclusion of this general debate, it might be well for us to review the basic philosophy of this Appalachian program.

First, let us address ourselves to the question of whether or not it constitutes favoritism or preferential treatment for one section of the country. Perhaps it is appropriate for me to comment on this subject since I represent a district rather far removed geographically from the Appalachian region. There is no conceivable way in which the district that I have the privilege of representing could become eligible for the entitlements under this bill.

And yet if we examine the broad sweep of the history of the United States and the actions of our Government, we are forced to conclude that this bill contains no more regional favoritism than literally hundreds and probably thousands of programs that have been advanced by this Congress.

As early as 1785, one of the very first years of the life of this struggling, infant Republic, the Northwest land ordinance was enacted requiring relatively more prosperous citizens of the better developed areas along the eastern seaboard to share of their affluence with those relatively less-developed and poverty-ridden areas west of the Ohio River. Ever since that time, there has been an absolute parade of legislation that superficially favors one area of the country. Almost any economic bill that we pass in Congress benefits to a greater extent than others either some geographic section or some economic group or some industrial or business interest.

Surely we have had many examples of regional programs. The Tennessee Valley Authority could be said to be nothing other than regional in its approach. The Bonneville Power Authority surely could be said to be nothing other than regional.

If it should be contended certain counties and certain States being eligible while others are not eligible would render this bill somehow subject to a constitutional challenge, then I invite the attention of the gentleman who raises that point to the fact that the Great Plains conservation program makes eligible a total of 408 counties in 10 different States—and only those are eligible—for the benefits of the Great Plains conservation program. Surely then that is a regional program.

Surely we could say nothing else but that the great reclamation program, which has reclaimed desert land through the benefits of irrigation in 11 of our Western States, is a regional program.

Certainly the agricultural subsidy programs that this Government has had for more than a generation are regional in their effect. Cotton is regional where it grows. Corn is regional. Wheat is regional. Peanuts and tobacco are regional. Therefore, the application of these programs is strictly regional.

Certainly one could not challenge the fact that our Economic Development Administration program approaches in a regional sense the scattered pockets of poverty throughout our country. The demonstration cities program that this Congress enacted applies to 40 or 50 individual cities. So these are local in their application. Every public power project, every public works project, every navigation project, every flood control project is regional or local in the application of its benefits. So there is nothing new in this principle.

If it is said that this would be favoritism or preferential treatment, then I should think we would have to see it as preferential only in the sense that it attempts to help the people of an economically deprived area of our country achieve something approaching economic parity with the rest of the country. That has been basically the purpose of these other bills I have described.

Parenthetically, may I add that my particular district does not qualify for eligibility under a single one of these scores of programs. Yet I have supported them, because I am convinced they are good for America. Surely it would not be productive of any legislation if each of us were to support only those bills that directly benefited his own district. Certainly we could not produce any legislative approach to domestic problems at all if that were our reaction.

This bill proceeds on the assumption bespoken by the late President John F. Kennedy when he said: "A rising tide raises all boats." Certainly if the people of the Appalachian region achieve a better state of economic self-sufficiency, it will help the entire Nation. They become better customers for the goods and products produced in the other districts of the Nation. They pay more taxes and thus pick up a fairer share of their portion of the tax burden of the Nation.

So we approach this from the standpoint that whenever any part of the American family falls on hard times, then it behooves the rest of us to assist as best we can to give them the tools by which they can better their own lot. That is the philosophy of this bill. It is not a handout. It is a hand up. It is only attempting to give to the people of an area that has become geographically and historically deprived the means by which it can lift itself by its own bootstraps.

The Appalachian region has witnessed a historical decline through no fault of its own, isolated by these great mountain barriers, isolated from commerce, having seen the decline of the three pillars of its economy—coal and farming and timber. These citizens need something else. Clearly they need the infrastructure to permit them to come into the last third of the 20th century and to make their contribution. This bill attempts to do that. It attempts to permit those in that region to better their lot by giving voca-

tional training to people who may have known nothing other than coal mining, which no longer is as economic an operation as it once was. It attempts to benefit them and the rest of the Nation by connecting them through this ribbon of concrete with the other parts of the Nation, that they may then make their contribution.

It is not a perfect bill. I believe that no one has made the contention that the program has become a panacea, but it has made strides in the 2 years of its life.

Perhaps one of the best proofs of the success of the program is the fact that many Members who most opposed it 2 years ago are now attempting to get their particular districts qualified to participate in its benefits. That to me indicates it has been to some degree successful.

It has raised hopes. It has permitted people to lift their chins and look to the future with a greater degree of enthusiasm in this historically smitten region.

On balance, I believe it is a good program.

This has been a constructive debate. Our committee attempted, in its deliberations, to take into account the legitimate and constructive criticisms of the administration of the program. We adopted many of the recommendations suggested by our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. They made some notable contributions to our committee deliberations.

Due to some of the amendments which were accepted in the committee approximately \$54 million has been deducted from the total cost of the bill.

I believe what we have ultimately brought to the House is a good package—not a perfect package; few things are, in this imperfect world—a good package which helps us to build one more paving block in the road to a better and stronger and more prosperous America for the future.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I must regretfully but vigorously oppose the present bill—regretfully because the legislation indicates that we are still far from developing a Federal grant-in-aid program which will bring assistance, in a precise and effective way, to the people of economically depressed areas, and vigorously because I can find no justification for supporting a bill which will authorize additional hundreds of millions of dollars for a program which has fallen so far short of its objective as the Appalachian regional development program has.

A program of this kind is essentially preferential and discriminatory, by its very nature. It singles out one part of this country for special assistance which is not available to other sections—not on the basis of need or of ability to use the aid in the national interest, but on the strength of an arbitrary geographical designation. It is undeniable that por-

tions of Appalachia are among the most deprived areas in the United States. But so are other parts of the country. Economic assistance should be provided wherever the need is great but it should be administered through programs which are available to all areas on the basis of their need and their potential for effective use of the aid.

The present program, Mr. Chairman, is a classic case of grants-in-aid gone wrong. In addition to being highly discriminatory, it has been wasteful, duplicating, and ineffective, and the pending bill proposes to proliferate these objectionable features. Instead of being limited to a region of similar economic characteristics and problems, it is proposed to expand it to embrace an area extending from Mississippi to upstate New York—an area which includes many regions and many different economic problems. Though designated and justified as an antipoverty program, its assistance goes as often as not to the region's more affluent parts. Rather than direct its aid specifically to people who need help, the program has devoted the great bulk of its funds to the improvement of existing highways, thereby freeing conventional Federal and State highway funds for use outside the region. The net gain in the fight against poverty seems pretty close to zero.

And now, through this bill, additional counties and States have their hands out, areas which have never been considered a part of the Appalachian region, as broad and loosely defined a description as that has already become. It is apparent, once again, that the easy availability of Federal money is just too much to resist.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, there are no circumstances which would justify legislation of this kind. But faced, as we are, with a terribly expensive war in Vietnam, with a proposed 10-percent income tax increase, with competing claims from superior programs for scarce resources, and with tragically unmet needs in the real war against poverty, then we have no alternative but to defeat the present legislation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, in this period of fiscal crisis and mounting war costs, we do not believe that special domestic programs such as the Appalachian Regional Development Act should be expanded and enlarged. S. 602 would expand this program by adding 24 new counties that are outside the established Appalachian region. It would authorize funds for new purposes and in excess of the amounts requested and appropriated in prior years. In addition, S. 602 would amend and expand the Public Works and Economic Development Act even though the administration did not ask for these amendments, made no provision for the additional authorized funds in the budget,

and presented no testimony regarding this proposal to the House committee.

When Congress enacted the Appalachian Regional Development Act, it did so on the basis that it was providing special assistance to help solve specific economic problems within an identifiable region. S. 602 would expand the region by adding 24 counties—one in New York, one in Tennessee, two in Alabama, and 20 in Mississippi. This is totally inconsistent with the original concept. The new counties in no way fit the description of "a mountain land boldly upthrust" and they are chiefly characterized by their lack of "ridges and twisted spurs and valleys." If the Appalachian region were to be enlarged to include counties such as these, it would mean that legislation designed to meet a unique problem in a specific economically deprived area has been changed into general assistance legislation. Moreover, other counties in the Appalachian range that do fit this description are not included.

Under the present Appalachian Regional Development Act, appropriation requests have been submitted as a part of the budget of the executive department responsible for implementing a particular program. Such requests have been considered along with all other appropriation requests by that department. The funds that appear to be necessary to operate a particular program then have been appropriated to the requesting department.

S. 602 would change this procedure completely. It would authorize the appropriation of the Appalachian development funds directly to the President. Thus the President, rather than the various executive departments, would be responsible for the proper administration, allocation, and expenditure of such funds. Under this system, there is a grave possibility that those who administer the programs could be effectively insulated from congressional scrutiny and oversight. In view of the pyramiding of officials through whom the funds will pass and the dilution of responsibility, this change cannot be justified.

As reported by the committee, S. 602 would authorize the appropriation of a total of \$220 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for Appalachian programs, other than the \$1.015 billion for 6 years for highways. Of this \$220 million, the President has requested the appropriation of \$64.2 million for fiscal year 1968, which is in line with the average annual expenditure of about \$55 million during the first 27 months of the program. Thus, if all of the funds requested by the President for 1968 are appropriated, there would remain \$155.8 million authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1969. This is almost three times the average annual expenditure to date and two and one-half times the President's 1968 budget request.

Unless the Johnson-Humphrey administration plans to launch a dramatically expanded spending program just prior to the election, there is no need for this sharp increase in authorization. We believe the amounts authorized by S. 602 for general Appalachian programs should be reduced to provide for a level of com-

mitments that the budget requests of the President now indicate will be undertaken.

Despite the fact that the basic purpose of S. 602 is to authorize the appropriation of funds for the continuation of the Appalachian development program, title II of this bill would amend and expand the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Proposals to amend this completely different and distinct act should be considered on their own merits. There is time to do this for all of the EDA authorizations run through fiscal 1968. Moreover, the administration did not ask for the immediate authorization of new programs for EDA, and neither the House nor the Senate Committee on Public Works heard testimony from the administration or from the regional Commission regarding these amendments.

On August 3, 1967, the President forwarded a message to Congress wherein he urged the immediate enactment of a 10-percent surtax. In this message, it was stated that unless expenditures are tightly controlled and the tax increase is imposed, the deficit for fiscal 1968 could be more than \$28 billion. The Secretary of the Treasury has warned that a budget deficit of this magnitude would force so much borrowing by the U.S. Treasury as to disrupt credit markets and send interest rates "sky high." We welcome this concern over the present fiscal situation and this newfound support for our efforts to cut governmental expenditures. We believe that the pledge of the Director of the Budget to cut \$2 billion in civilian spending is a step in the right direction. We hope that it will be implemented.

Unfortunately, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has given no indication that it is really prepared to carry through on this pledge. Its theories on cutting government expenditures have been much preached but little practiced. If this country is to avoid a sharp tax increase, substantial spending reductions must be made. Certainly, in this period of fiscal crisis, the Appalachian program should not be expanded.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. It has particular relevance in my State and for the whole Nation as well.

The objective of this program is to restore or elevate various parts of the country to economic equality. It is preferential treatment only so far as any Federal program is for any purpose. The objective, plainly stated, is equal opportunity to share in the Nation's abundance.

What is different and interesting about this program is the way in which it sets out to achieve its purpose. The formation of the regional Commission for Appalachia, for New England, for the Coastal Plains, for the Great Lakes, for the Ozarks, and for the four corners is founded on the theory of States rights, State sovereignty, and State equality within the federal system. These commissions are doubly significant vehicles for the accomplishments of this purpose.

They are significant in their makeup—the partnership of the State and Federal Governments—and they are significant in what they portend for the future.

If we ever expect to accomplish anything conclusive and beneficial, particularly in the field of domestic economic development, it will have to be in this way. It will have to be the Federal Government working in concert with the States as their partner rather than as their ruler.

We have seen this concept succeed already in the Appalachian Regional Commission. This Commission has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that such a governmental partnership can work. This is reason enough for us to approve its continuation.

The other regional commissions, cut from the same cloth, should enjoy the same success and accomplish the same things. This is reason enough that they should be allowed to begin.

The Committee on Public Works has been vindicated in its confidence 2 years ago that this program would work. The evidence has shown that we were right then and the House agreed with us. This is no time to rescind our action or regret our approval. This is the time to say, "good job, keep going."

We should not overlook the fact of the larger national meaning of this bill. Besides giving vitality to the theory that State and Federal Governments can be completely compatible, and besides bringing different regions of the country to a full productive share of the regional economy, this bill can very well serve to ease our massive urban problems.

We all know that the urban problems are compounded, if not actually created, by the mass migrations from rural areas and small cities and towns into our large metropolitan centers. If a way can be found to bring prosperity and livelihood to these rural sections to slow down the rush to the cities, would not that at least give the cities a little breathing space? The answer of course lies in economics which is really what makes the country tick. This bill is geared to redress the economic imbalance in this Nation. It may very well help redress the social imbalance also.

The committee was impressed that both titles of this bill are worthwhile. We worked hard to improve them.

I know personally how well the Appalachian program works and I am optimistic that the Coastal Plains program can be at least as successful.

I urge you to support this bill and to do something positive for the Nation which you can defend and justify under any circumstances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967".

SEC. 102. Section 102 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (hereinafter in this title referred to as "the Act") is amended (1) by inserting "and" at the end of clause (7); (2) by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of clause (8) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and (3) by striking out clause (9).

SEC. 103. Section 105 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 105. (a) For the period ending on June 30, 1967, the administrative expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the Federal Government. Thereafter, such expenses shall be paid 50 per centum by the Federal Government and 50 per centum by the States in the region, except that the expenses of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff shall be paid solely by the Federal Government. The share to be paid by each State shall be determined by the Commission. The Federal Cochairman shall not participate or vote in such determination. No assistance authorized by this Act shall be furnished to any State or to any political subdivision or any resident of any State, nor shall the State member of the Commission participate or vote in any determination by the Commission while such State is delinquent in payment of its share of such expenses.

"(b) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$1,700,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969. Not to exceed \$400,000 of such authorization shall be available for the expense of the Federal Cochairman, his alternate, and his staff. Unexpended balances of appropriations under the authorization in this section prior to amendment by the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967 shall remain available for the purposes of this section, as amended, until expended."

SEC. 104. Clause (7) of section 106 of the Act, entitled "ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS OF THE COMMISSION", is amended to read as follows:

"(7) enter into and perform such contracts, leases (including, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the lease of office space for any term expiring no later than June 30, 1971), cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States (which is hereby so authorized to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association or corporation."

SEC. 105. Title I of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"COMMISSION EMPLOYEE PROTECTIONS

"SEC. 109. Section 5334(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'For the purpose of this subsection, an individual employed by the Appalachian Regional Commission under section 106(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, or by a regional commission established pursuant to section 502 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, under section 506(2) of such Act, who was a Federal employee immediately prior to such employment by a commission and within six months after separation from such employment is employed in a position to which this subchapter applies, shall be treated as if transferred from a position in the executive

branch to which this subchapter does not apply.'"

SEC. 106. Section 201 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY SYSTEM

"SEC. 201. (a) In order to provide a highway system which, in conjunction with the Interstate System and other Federal-aid highways in the Appalachian region, will open up an area or areas with a developmental potential where commerce and communication have been inhibited by lack of adequate access, the Secretary of Transportation (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to assist in the construction of an Appalachian development highway system and local access roads serving the Appalachian region. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways, and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act, shall apply, respectively, to the development highway system and the local access roads. Construction on the development highway system shall not exceed two thousand seven hundred miles. Construction of local access roads shall not exceed one thousand two hundred miles that will serve specific recreational, residential, educational, commercial, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program.

"(b) The Commission shall transmit to the Secretary its designations of (1) the general corridor location and termini of the development highways, (2) local access roads to be constructed, (3) priorities for the construction of segments of the development highways, and (4) other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member participates in or votes on such designations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway departments of the State which he represents.

"(c) In no event shall the Secretary assist in any construction (including right-of-way acquisition) which would require for its completion the expenditure of Federal funds (other than funds available under title 23, United States Code) in excess of the appropriations authorization in subsection (g). On its completion each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system and each development highway and local access road shall be required to be maintained by the State as provided for Federal-aid highways in title 23, United States Code.

"(d) In the construction of highways and roads authorized under this section, the States may give special preference to the use of materials and products indigenous to the Appalachian region.

"(e) For the purposes of research and development in the use of coal and coal products in highway construction and maintenance, the Secretary is authorized to require each participating State, to the maximum extent possible, to use coal derivatives in the construction of not to exceed 10 per centum of the roads authorized under this Act.

"(f) Federal assistance to any construction project under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the costs of such project, unless the Commission determines that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall such Federal assistance exceed 70 per centum of such costs.

"(g) To carry out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, \$715,000,000 for the four-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971.

"(h) (1) When a participating State proceeds to construct a segment of a development highway without the aid of Federal funds, in accordance with all procedures and

requirements applicable to the construction of segments of Appalachian development highways with such funds, except insofar as such procedures and requirements limit a State to the construction of projects for which Federal funds have previously been appropriated, the Secretary, upon application by the State and with the approval of the Commission, is authorized to pay to the State the Federal share not to exceed 70 per centum of the costs of the construction of such segment, from any sums appropriated and allocated to such State to carry out this section.

"(2) This subsection shall not be construed as a commitment or obligation on the part of the United States to provide funds for segments of development highways constructed under this subsection, and shall not increase the limitation on construction in subsection (c)."

SEC. 107. Section 202 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"DEMONSTRATION HEALTH PROJECTS

"SEC. 202. (a) In order to demonstrate the value of adequate health facilities and services to the economic development of the region, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants for the planning, construction, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health projects, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers, and other facilities and services necessary to health. Grants for such construction (including the acquisition of privately owned facilities not operated for profit and initial equipment) shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291-291o), the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 282), and other laws authorizing grants for the construction of health-related facilities, without regard to any provisions therein relating to appropriation authorization ceilings or to allotments among the States. Grants under this section shall be made solely out of funds specifically appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this Act and shall not be taken into account in the computation of the allotments among the States made pursuant to any other provision of law.

"(b) No grant for the construction or equipment of any component of a demonstration health project shall exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Federal contribution may be provided entirely from funds authorized under this section or in combination with funds provided under other Federal grant-in-aid programs for the construction or equipment of health-related facilities. Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share in such other programs, funds authorized under this section may be used to increase Federal grants for component facilities of a demonstration health project to a maximum of 80 per centum of the costs of such facilities.

"(c) Grants under this section for operation (including initial operating funds and operating deficits comprising among other items the costs of attracting, training, and retraining qualified personnel) of a demonstration health project, whether or not constructed with funds authorized by this section, may be made for up to 100 per centum of the costs thereof for the two-year period beginning, for each component facility or service assisted under any such operating grant, on the first day that such facility or service is in operation as a part of the project. For the next three years of operations such grants shall not exceed 50 per centum of such costs. No grant for operation of a demonstration health project shall be made unless the facility is publicly owned, or owned by a public or private nonprofit organization, and is not operated for profit. No grants for operation of a demonstration

health project shall be made after five years following the commencement of the initial grant for operation of the project. No such grants shall be made unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is satisfied that the operation of the project will be conducted under efficient management practices designed to obviate operating deficits. Notwithstanding section 104 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 554), a health-related facility constructed under title I of that Act may be a component of a demonstration health project eligible for operating grant assistance under this section.

"(d) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide funds to the Commission for the support of its Health Advisory Committee and to make grants for expenses of planning necessary for the development and operation of demonstration health projects for the region. The amount of any such grant shall not exceed 75 per centum of such expenses.

"(e) Not to exceed \$50,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 108. Subsection (1) of section 203 of the Act, entitled "LAND STABILIZATION, CONSERVATION, AND EROSION CONTROL", is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Not to exceed \$19,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 204 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 110. (a) Clause (1) of subsection (a) of section 205 of the Act, entitled "MINING AREA RESTORATION", is amended to read as follows:

"(1) make financial contributions to States in the region to seal and fill voids in abandoned coal mines and abandoned oil and gas wells, and to reclaim and rehabilitate lands affected by the strip and surface mining and processing of coal and other minerals, including lands affected by waste piles, in accordance with provisions of the Act of July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 571 et seq.), to the extent applicable, without regard to section 2(b) thereof (30 U.S.C. 572(b)) or to any provisions therein limiting assistance to anthracite coal formation, or to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Grants under this paragraph shall be made wholly out of funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this Act."

(b) Strike out clause (3) of subsection (a) of section 205 of the Act.

(c) Subsection (b) of section 205 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the fiscal years 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal share of mining area restoration projects, including reasonable planning and engineering costs, carried out under subsection (a) of this section and conducted on lands other than federally owned lands shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof. The non-Federal share of the total cost of any project carried out under subsection (a) of this section may include reasonable land acquisition costs incurred in acquiring land necessary for the purposes of implementing such project, if such land is acquired after the date of enactment of the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967."

(d) The first sentence of subsection (d) of section 205 of the Act is amended to read as follows: "Not to exceed \$30,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 111. Subsection (g) of section 206 of the Act, entitled "WATER RESOURCE SURVEY", is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Not to exceed \$2,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 112. Part A of title II of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING AND OTHER PRELIMINARY EXPENSES OF PROPOSED HOUSING PROJECTS UNDER SECTION 221 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

"SEC. 207. (a) In order to encourage and facilitate the construction or rehabilitation of housing to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income families and individuals, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants and loans from the Appalachian Housing Fund established by this section, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative organizations, or to public bodies, for expenses of planning and of obtaining an insured mortgage for a housing construction or rehabilitation project, under section 221 of the National Housing Act (hereinafter in this section referred to as 'section 221'), in any area of the Appalachian region determined by the Commission to have significant potential for future growth.

"(b) No grant under this section shall exceed 80 per centum of those administrative expenses, incident to planning a project and obtaining an insured mortgage under section 221, which the Secretary considers not to be recoverable from the proceeds of a mortgage insured under such section: *Provided*, That no grant shall be made to an organization established for profit.

"(c) No loan under this section shall exceed 80 per centum of the cost of planning a project and obtaining an insured mortgage under section 221, including, but not limited to, preliminary surveys and analyses of market needs, preliminary site engineering and architectural fees, site options, Federal Housing Administration and Federal National Mortgage Association fees, and construction loan fees and discounts. Loans may be made without interest, or at any market or below market interest rate authorized for a mortgage insured under section 221: *Provided*, That any loan made to an organization established for profit shall bear interest at the prevailing market rate authorized for a mortgage insured under such section. The Secretary may, except in the case of a loan to an organization established for profit, waive the repayment of all or any part of a loan made under this section, including interest, which he finds the borrower is unable to recover from the proceeds of a mortgage insured under section 221.

"(d) All funds allocated to the Secretary for the purposes of this section shall be deposited in a fund which shall be known as the Appalachian Housing Fund and shall be used as a revolving fund by the Secretary for carrying out such purposes. General expenses of administration of this section may be charged to the fund. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operation may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

"(e) Not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 113. (a) Subsection (a) of section 211 of the Act, entitled "VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FACILITIES", is amended by inserting before the word "needed" in the first sentence, the following: "and for the equipment of such facilities and other school facilities".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 211 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Not to exceed \$26,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 114. Subsection (b) of section 212 of the Act, entitled "SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS", is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Not to exceed \$6,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 115. (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461(a)) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (8) and all of clause (9) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(9) the Appalachian Regional Commission, for comprehensive planning for the Appalachian region as defined by section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; and

"(10) local development districts, certified under section 301 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, for comprehensive planning for their entire areas, or for metropolitan planning, urban planning, county planning, or small municipality planning within such areas in the Appalachian region, and for planning for Appalachian regional programs."

(b) The proviso of the first sentence of section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "States" the words "and local development districts".

SEC. 116. Section 214 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SUPPLEMENTS TO FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

"SEC. 214. (a) In order to enable the people, States, and local communities of the region, including local development districts, to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share, the President is authorized to provide funds to the Federal Cochairman to be used for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to projects under Federal grant-in-aid programs, as hereafter defined, above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such projects otherwise authorized by the applicable law. Funds shall be so provided for Federal grant-in-aid programs for which funds are available under the Acts authorizing such programs and shall be available without regard to any appropriation authorization ceilings in such Acts. Any finding, report, certification, or documentation required to be submitted to the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of any Federal grant-in-aid program shall be accepted by the Federal Cochairman with respect to a supplemental grant for any project under such program.

"(b) The Federal portion of such costs shall not be increased in excess of the percentages established by the Commission, and shall in no event exceed 80 per centum thereof.

"(c) The term 'Federal grant-in-aid programs' as used in this section means those Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized by this Act for the construction or equipment of facilities, and all other Federal grant-in-aid programs authorized on or before August 1, 1967, by Acts other than this Act for the acquisition of land or the construction or equipment of facilities, including but not limited to grant-in-aid programs authorized by the following Acts: Federal Water Pollution Control Act; Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; title VI of the Public Health Service Act; Vocational Edu-

cation Act of 1963; Library Services Act; Federal Airport Act; part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934; Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; National Defense Education Act of 1958. The term shall not include (A) the program for the construction of the development highway system authorized by section 201 of this Act or any other program relating to highway or road construction, or (B) any other program for which loans or other Federal financial assistance, except a grant-in-aid program, is authorized by this or any other Act.

"(d) Not to exceed \$71,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 117. (a) The first sentence of section 221 of the Act, entitled "MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT", is amended by striking out "exclusive of Federal funds," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "exclusive of expenditures for participation in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and exclusive of local funds and Federal funds."

(b) The second sentence of such section is amended by inserting after "Highways" the following: "and expenditures of local funds and Federal funds."

SEC. 118. Section 223 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION"

"Sec. 223. No program or project authorized under any section of this title shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the program or project have been determined by the responsible Federal official to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of Federal laws which he administers that are not inconsistent with this Act, and (2) the Commission has approved such program or project and has determined that it meets the applicable criteria under section 224 and will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling."

SEC. 119. (a) Subsection (a) of section 224 of the Act, entitled "PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA", is amended (1) by striking out "In developing recommendations on the" and inserting in lieu thereof: "In considering"; and (2) by striking out "within those recommendations".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(1) to assist establishments relocating from one area to another;"

SEC. 120. Section 302 of the Act, entitled "GRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS AND FOR RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS", is amended by (1) striking out subsections (a) through (c); (2) redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and (3) inserting the following new subsections (a) through (d):

"(a) The President is authorized—

"(1) to make grants to the Commission for administrative expenses, including technical services, of local development districts, but (A) the amount of any such grant shall not exceed 75 per centum of such expenses, (B) no grants for administrative expenses shall be made for a local development district for a period in excess of three years beginning on the date the initial grant is made for such development district, and (C) the local development district contributions for administrative expenses may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services; and

"(2) to make grants to the Commission for investigation, research, studies, technical assistance, and demonstration projects, and for training programs, but not for construction purposes, which will further the purposes of this Act.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to

make a survey and study of acid pollution in the region resulting from mining activities and the effects of such pollution, in full cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior and other appropriate Federal, State, and local departments and agencies, with the objective of developing a comprehensive action program for the appropriate control, reduction, or elimination of such pollution in the region or the effects of such pollution. The Commission shall submit to the President a report, including specific recommendations for such program and for the policies under which it should be conducted, and the President shall submit the report to the Congress, together with his recommendations, not later than March 31, 1969. The study shall, among other matters—

"(1) Identify sources of acid mine pollution in the region and their type, area, ownership, and other characteristics; the relative contribution of each source; and the impact of each source on water quality in the streams affected.

"(2) Identify present and potential water-using and other activities which are affected by acid mine pollution in the region, or originating in the region, and the economic and social costs and effects attributable to such pollution.

"(3) Identify known methods and costs for the control and abatement of acid mine pollution.

"(4) Estimate economic and social benefits, public and private, that are likely to result from reducing to various levels acid mine pollution in the streams of the region and identify the types of beneficiaries and the relative distribution of the benefits to such beneficiaries.

"(5) Consider the appropriate roles of Federal, State, and private interests in programs for the control, reduction, or elimination of acid mine pollution in the region and the relative costs which each should bear, including specifically (A) the extent, if any, to which private interests can bear the cost of such programs within the economics of mining activity, (B) the effectiveness of past action by Federal, State, and local units of government in remedying or controlling the adverse effects of acid mine pollution, (C) relationships which might be established among Federal, State, and local units of government, and with private interests, for implementing and funding such programs, and (D) the need for appropriate Federal and State legislation, including adequate enforcement provisions, for such programs.

"(6) Formulate a program for the appropriate control, reduction, or elimination of acid mine pollution in the region, including the identification of specific objectives and costs, with due consideration to: (A) the developmental effects of the program, (B) the economic benefits of the program in relation to costs, (C) the social effects of the program, (D) the avoidance of unwarranted financial gain to private interests, and (E) the types and sources of aid required to accomplish the program.

"(c) (1) The Commission shall, as required by the President, maintain accurate and complete records of transactions and activities financed with Federal funds and report thereon to the President. The records of the Commission shall be available for audit with respect to such grants by the President and the Comptroller General or their duly authorized representatives.

"(2) Recipients of Federal assistance under the provisions of this section shall, as required by the Commission, maintain accurate and complete records of transactions and activities financed with Federal funds and report thereon to the Commission. Such records shall be available for audit by the President, the Comptroller General, and the Commission or their duly authorized representatives.

"(d) Not to exceed \$10,000,000 of the funds authorized in section 401 of this Act for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, shall be available to carry out this section. Not to exceed \$3,000,000 of such authorization shall be available for the purposes of subsection (b)."

SEC. 121. Section 303 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROJECT APPROVAL"

"SEC. 303. An application for a grant or for any other assistance for a program or project under this Act shall be made through the State member of the Commission representing such applicant, and such State member shall evaluate the application for approval. Only applications for programs and projects which are approved by a State member as meeting the requirements for assistance under the Act shall be approved for assistance. No project shall be approved by the Commission unless the Commission is satisfied that the project will be properly administered, operated, and maintained."

SEC. 122. Section 401 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS"

"SEC. 401. In addition to the appropriations authorized in section 105 and in section 201 for the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$220,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1969, to carry out this Act."

SEC. 123. (a) Section 403 of the Act, entitled "DEFINITION OF APPALACHIAN REGION", is amended—

(1) by inserting in the clause relating to the counties in Alabama after "Jefferson," the following: "Lamar," and after "Morgan," the following: "Pickens";

(2) by inserting after the clause relating to the counties in Maryland the following: "In Mississippi, the counties of Alcorn, Benton, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Clay, Itawamba, Kemper, Lee, Lowndes, Marshall, Monroe, Noxubee, Oktibbeha, Pontotoc, Prentiss, Tippah, Tishomingo, Union, Webster, and Winston;

"In New York, the counties of Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schoharie, Schuyler, Steuben, Tioga, and Tompkins"; and

(3) by inserting in the clause relating to the counties in Tennessee after "Campbell" the following: "Cannon,"

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out the colon following "West Virginia" and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all of the remainder of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"No recommendation for any change in the definition of the Appalachian region as set forth in this section shall be proposed or considered by the Commission without a prior resolution by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, directing a study of such change."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and

the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE CHALLENGES FACING THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the challenges facing the labor movement for the good of the entire community, especially those still in poverty, were the object of attention by Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and vice president of the AFL-CIO, in a special Labor Day radio broadcast.

I include the text of Mr. Beirne's address, heard on the American Broadcasting Co. radio network, in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT JOSEPH A. BEIRNE

It is always a temptation on an occasion such as this . . . the 85th year in which we celebrate Labor Day . . . to review our achievements and to count the milestones in our progress one by one. I propose to yield to that temptation only in the way that an author of a book, very popular early in this century, yielded to it. The author, Edward Bellamy, called his book *Looking Backward*. But the point in time from which he looked backward was a period many years in the future. He used that device to project his concept of our society as it would exist . . . or as he thought it should exist . . . and to comment on the present state of affairs.

And perhaps that is the only vantage point that we can use . . . a period some years distant . . . to look at ourselves today. The world and its customs and patterns are changing so fast that any attempt to look at our society from a stationary position would limit us to a very brief glimpse as it whizzed by.

President Kennedy was fond of illustrating the pace of our change in these terms. Condense if you will . . . he would say . . . the fifty thousand years of man's recorded history into half a century . . . fifty years. On that scale man emerged from his cave 10 years ago. Five years ago man learned to write. Last month he got electric lights and telephones and automobiles and airplanes. Only last week, nuclear power. And we will have reached the stars before midnight tonight.

We are told by eminent professors that about half of all the scientific material ever published has been published since 1950 . . . that eighty percent of all the scientists the world has known are alive today. And we are told by the chairman of our atomic energy commission that man might be able to create life itself with all its mysteries before the end of the century.

Each of us, I know, has his own yardstick for measuring change, whether it's the fact that store-bought pies don't taste as good as those that mother used to make or whether the skirts are above the knees or the other way around.

And what this all has to do with Labor Day . . . is simply this. It emphasizes the speed of the change that is taking place in our society. More important, it emphasizes the need of each of us to keep pace with that change.

If we want to look backward we have to keep moving forward very fast indeed.

And that is what the American labor movement is doing today . . . moving forward fast . . . looking ahead to the new problems we will face . . . looking ahead for the solutions to these problems. We recognize that the labor movement . . . to survive and to justify its survival . . . must be working today in the context of today's society.

For the inescapable fact is that our society is infinitely more complex than it was in 1882 when Peter McGuire led his Labor Day parade into Union Square. And the labor movement is infinitely more inter-connected and inter-twined in our society than it was in those more simple days.

Today the range of interests of the American labor movement is the range of interests of the American people. We are interested in the quality and caliber of our schools . . . in our communications system . . . in the nature of our cities and the ability of our police forces to cope with the kinds of problems that exist . . . far more sophisticated than ever before. We are concerned . . . and vitally so . . . with air and water pollution . . . with the conservation of our natural resources. Our nation's tax structure and economic policy . . . our relations with the nations in Europe, Latin America and the Orient . . . the space program and its implications for the world in which we live . . . these, too, are matter of concern for the American labor movement.

The fact is that there is only one substantial private organization in the United States whose primary dedication is to the widest and best interests of all the American people. It is the only organization whose vast resources, manpower and money, are used in the interests of all the American people. And that organization is the American labor movement represented by the AFL-CIO.

By substantial I mean well organized, large and influential. By private organization I mean one that is not part of our governmental structure. By best interests of the American people I mean the interests of the business community, the educational community, the religious community as well as the rank and file citizen. I specifically suggest the AFL-CIO and its member unions work day in and day out, longer and harder, and expend its manpower and money in the interests of the entire American community rather than in the narrow area of responsibility to dues-paying members only.

It is for this reason and within this context that the American labor movement today is reaching out in two broad directions. The first is toward the growing area of white and grey collar workers . . . the people who handle and service the machines and the products of those machines, whether the products are paper work or a harder substance . . . whose need for protection against exploitation and misuse is as great as that of the miner or railroad worker 60 years ago.

To those of you who fall into this category . . . who spend your working lives in today's white collar factories producing paper work . . . I extend a cordial invitation. Visit your nearest union office . . . my own union, the Communications Workers of America . . . CWA . . . would be glad to help . . . and find out about today's unions. Find out what they're doing for other people . . . in the newspaper and radio industries . . . in insurance companies and electronic data processing firms . . . for teachers and nurses. You'll find people like yourselves . . . people interested only in translating the spirit of our American democracy into everyday,

practical terms . . . interested only in helping our country and the labor movement which serves it . . . move ahead toward a fuller realization of the American dream.

You need our strength just as we need yours.

Our second major area of concern is the existence of poverty in our country and the disturbances in our cities that are a reflection of that poverty . . . poverty of morale as well as of pocket.

We in the American labor movement constitute the front line troops in our nation's war against poverty. Recently the Communications Workers negotiated an agreement with one of the nation's telephone companies that opens the door wide to training for those who are now disadvantaged.

From a longer range point of view, we must improve our schools so that the people we train today will be able to cope with the technology of tomorrow. The teaching machines and the modern instructional techniques now in use in private industry and private schools must be made available on the broadest possible public basis. If, in earlier days, it was a matter of sound public policy to provide each of our children with a free grade school education, as a minimum, surely in today's society and that of tomorrow, we should regard it as a matter of sound public policy to provide a free education through the doctor's degree for everyone who has the ability and the desire to reach that goal.

And we need to get on with the job of eliminating our slums and our ghettos. There's little excuse for a nation as wealthy and resourceful as ours to tolerate rat infested slums . . . waterless, airless rooms with five or six people to the room . . . trash-filled streets . . . parks in which one dare not walk after night-fall.

Poverty is an old and ancient enemy of ours. We have faced it in the mining camps . . . in the company towns . . . on the waterfront . . . in the factory lofts of great cities . . . wherever working people were without means to fight exploitation.

It remains today our relentless foe . . . a barrier between the people of our land and the promise of our land. It is a foe against which we have won many battles but not yet the war.

Ending poverty in America . . . keeping pace with our galloping technology and applying its benefits fairly and equitably . . . building a society of unlimited opportunity and boundless horizons . . . these are the goals of the American labor movement as we look "backward" on this Labor Day of 1967. And, by our own good efforts and with the help of God, we shall achieve them.

THE TEXAS RANGERS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the lead article in the Wall Street Journal dealt with one of the most famous law enforcement agencies in the world. Except for the Northwest Mounted Police, probably the best-known police organization in history is the Texas Rangers, all 62 of them.

The Journal, a respected publication, pointed out some aspects of the current storm raging over the Rangers concerning attempts by a union to organize Latin

American farm laborers in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. A detachment of Rangers was sent some months ago, by Gov. James Connally to restore law and order in the sometimes violent situation. As a result of the Rangers' usual efficient handling of the situation, they have been barraged with charges ranging from brutality to infringement of civil rights.

If there is any truth in these charges, I certainly do not condone misdeeds. However, it is my view and the view of respected law enforcement officials around the Nation that the Rangers are one of the best groups of lawmen in the world. They have an unparalleled record of arrests leading to the conviction of criminals. There is no denying that the Rangers are a tough bunch. Their code of honor is the chivalry of the Old West; their code of law is equal justice for all and swift, sure punishment for offenders. Like Canada's Mounties, the Rangers always get their man.

The Texas Rangers really need no defense, for their proud record is already secure in history. However, it is interesting to note that such a man as Mr. Ferris Lucas, executive director of the National Sheriffs Association, says he considers the Rangers one of the Nation's best police groups. Mr. Wendell W. Faile, national director of public relations for the National Police Officers Association, said his organization views the Rangers as "one hell of an effective law enforcement agency. We have been closely following the Rio Grande Valley situation and think if anything the Rangers should be commended for their work there."

One of the criticisms has been that the Rangers harass minority groups. The Rangers are an elite corps of the Texas Department of Public Safety. Often, Rangers are recruited from within the department's own ranks. Significantly, a number of men of Latin American ancestry serve in the department. Further, one of the Rangers' most famous officers was of Spanish ancestry. Capt. M. T. "Lone Wolf" Gonzales retired a few years ago after a long and honor-filled career with the Rangers.

A spokesman for the department of public safety has assured me that there is no discrimination because of race in the selection of Rangers, although it is difficult for anyone to join this select force. There are now more than 5,000 applications on file.

The Texas Rangers are under attack, but I say to them to keep their own unwritten motto in mind: "A Ranger Never Retreats."

Mr. Speaker, the article in the Journal I referred to is as follows:

THE TEXAS RANGERS—LAWMEN GET THEIR MAN, BUT THEIR TACTICS ARE CURRENTLY UNDER FIRE—CELEBRATED FORCE IS ACCUSED OF STRIKEBREAKING, ASSAULT; IT TERMS CHARGES FALSE—LAW AND ORDER, RIGHT AND JUSTICE

(By Dennis Farney)

RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.—Sporting six-guns and white stetsons, the legendary Texas Rangers brought "the law" to this tense border town this year. The result: An uproar that could threaten their national reputation as elite lawmen.

Officially, the tough, taciturn Rangers came to keep order in a bitter strike to organize a

farm workers union here in the Rio Grande Valley. But critics charge that the Rangers broke the strike, assaulted and intimidated union organizers and sympathizers and sided with management from the beginning.

Now the Rangers are embroiled in a controversy that reaches to Texas Gov. John Connally and the U.S. Senate. Ralph Yarborough, Democratic Senator from Texas who is a political foe of the Democratic governor, calls the Rangers "Connally's strikebreakers." The Rangers have been investigated by the FBI and an arm of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. A Senate subcommittee has criticized them. In Texas, Mexican-American political groups are calling for their abolition.

The dispute has even produced a hit record—a hit, at least, among the Mexican-American farm workers who support the unionization attempt. It describes itself, in Spanish, as "a sad story about these poor campesinos (countrymen) who were beaten by these damned Rangers." It calls Mr. Connally "a bad governor who hates the Mexicans and laughs at suffering."

A RANGER NEVER RETREATS

Controversy, of course, long has dogged the colorful Rangers, who still embody the tradition of the frontier Texan: Independent, free-wheeling and quick on the draw. Formally organized in 1835 during the Texas revolution, Rangers fought in the Mexican War, helped drive the Indians from Texas into Oklahoma, faced down gunslingers and weathered periodic reorganizations as their political support waxed and waned. "Chivalrous, bold and impetuous in action, he (the Ranger) is yet wary and calculating, always impatient of restraint, and sometimes unscrupulous and unmerciful," wrote a U.S. Army officer who observed the Rangers during the Mexican War.

But rarely has the criticism come from U.S. Senators or received national publicity. And so the Rangers—who live by the unwritten code "a Ranger never retreats"—lash back angrily.

"The history of the Texas Rangers has always been filled with minority people who for devious reasons have tried to abolish the Rangers," says Col. Homer Garrison, head of the Texas Department of Public Safety, which includes Rangers. "Criminals and racketeers have tried it, and in this day of rather perverted ideas of the rights of people" it is happening again, he maintains.

Sitting ramrod-straight at his desk, the colonel adds: "I'm as confident as I sit in this chair that as long as there is a state of Texas there will be a Texas Ranger force—because the people of this state believe in law and order, right and justice." Col. Garrison calls charges of Ranger brutality "totally false and unfounded." Gov. Connally says the Rangers were sent "as a routine matter to enforce the law" and "have nothing to hide."

AN ELITE BRIGADE

Attacks on the Rangers appear far from over, however. Sen. Harrison Williams (D., N.J.) gathered complaints against the lawmen during hearings this summer by his migratory labor subcommittee. He probably will cite them in his legislative push to bring farm laborers under the National Labor Relations Act. Rangers are defendants in suits filed by union members and the Texas Council of Churches. And in Washington, a spokesman says the Justice Department still is weighing the FBI report on "allegations of Ranger brutality and Ranger misconduct."

The Rangers' original purpose was to guard the Texas frontier. Today, only 62 strong (there were 1,089 Rangers at one point during the Civil War), they are a kind of elite brigade, ready to back up local authorities or tackle special problems. They are handpicked men. Ranger headquarters has a file of about 5,000 applications; more arrive daily, "not just from Texas but from all

countries of the Free World," says Col. Garrison. Recently admission requirements were changed so that Rangers no longer need be native Texans.

There never have been many Rangers, but the corps' tradition of individual courage runs deep. Once a cowtown that had sent an urgent telegram requesting a whole company of Rangers to control a mob was dismayed when only one, Capt. Bill McDonald, stepped off the train. "Well," drawled the captain to the anxious citizens committee, "you ain't got but one mob, have you?" The mob promptly dispersed. More recently, single Rangers scattered angry mobs protesting school integration in Mansfield and Texarkana.

LET'S CUT OUT THIS STUFF

When 80 inmates seized control of the Rusk, Texas, state hospital for the criminally insane, captured its superintendent and six attendants and threatened to kill them, state and local police ringed the institution, and Ranger Capt. R. A. Crowder walked inside alone. Ten minutes later he emerged, followed by the superintendent, the guards—and the 80 inmates who then stacked their weapons and surrendered.

With typical Ranger terseness, Capt. Crowder later explained: "I just said (to the inmates) 'Let's cut out this stuff.'" And Ranger George Roach, who once single-handedly disarmed a man who had barricaded himself inside a barn, noted merely in his report: "I apprehended the man."

Ranger companies still keep horses for use in rugged areas. But more often they pursue lawbreakers in their fleet of 1967 Plymouth Furys or by airplane or boat. One Ranger captain got his man by borrowing an Army tank. For the first six months this year, Rangers arrested 589 suspects in felony crimes, resulting so far in 430 convictions, 3,052 years of prison sentences, two death penalties and two life imprisonments.

The Rangers' fame is widespread among criminologists. "They're the nation's first state police," says Franklin G. Ashburn, a former academic criminologist and now director of planning and research for the Baltimore Police Department. "From what I hear, they're a good outfit with high esprit. Of course they might be a little flashy for Maryland. But if that's what the citizenry wants—cowboy boots, pearl-handled revolvers and all that—okay."

For decades, Texas Rangers have been sent into explosive surroundings, and the situation here in Rio Grande City is no exception. Officials of the National Farm Workers Organizing Committee, which successfully organized grape pickers at Delano, Calif., had been working for more than a year without any real breakthrough, amid conditions of extreme poverty. (Three or four Starr County families live on less than \$3,000 a year.) There already had been trouble: A railroad trestle had been burned, and costly vandalism had occurred at La Casita Farms, the main union target.

Critics see the Ranger intervention as the predictable result of a political pattern that favors the growers at every turn. Starr County Attorney Frank Randall Nye, who officially requested the Ranger aid, is on retainer to Starr Produce Co., which operates another big farm here. At the time of the Ranger intervention, Starr County already listed 40 "special deputies," including the brother of Ray Rochester, La Casita's manager. And a union source maintains that when things got hot, Gov. Connally's office set up a press conference in Austin for attorney Morris Atlas, who represents La Casita.

"Traditionally, the Mexican-American has looked upon Rangers as the ones who protected the white—the Anglo—and his encroachment upon old Spanish land claims," says Texas State Senator Joe Bernal, who

wants the Texas Senate to investigate the Rangers' role here. "The Mexican-American in South Texas has taken law enforcement by the Texas Ranger as one of the everyday hardships he has to live with."

THE UNION'S CHARGES

After their arrival, "the Rangers had no communication with union members at all, except when they arrested them," claims James McKeithan, union attorney. Union members say they saw La Casita's Ray Rochester buy the Rangers dinner at the Rattler's Den, a local restaurant; another observer saw a local politician treating them to a barbecue. Concluded three liberal Texas state senators who conducted an unofficial investigation: "They (the Rangers) assumed a partisan stance on their very first day."

In three mass arrests, the Rangers charged about 50 union members and sympathizers with picketing in violation of Texas laws, disturbing the peace or other offenses. Union members charge bitterly that the Rangers escorted Mexican workers to the fields, blunting the strike's impact.

Several matters are at the heart of the controversy. One is the arrest of the Rev. Edgar A. Krueger, his wife, Esther, and a friend, Doug Adair. Mr. Krueger, openly sympathetic to the strike effort, is a United Church of Christ minister assigned by the Texas Council of Churches to serve the farm workers. Mr. Adair is an editor of a small pro-strike magazine.

Mr. Krueger maintains the Rangers arrested him while he photographed them guiding a melon train through a crossing that had been picketed earlier. He says, when Mrs. Krueger attempted to photograph the Rangers arresting her husband, she was arrested and her camera forcibly taken from her. The Rangers saw Mr. Adair looking on and arrested him too, Mr. Krueger alleges.

In a statement given Sen. Williams' subcommittee, Mr. Krueger said: "One of the Rangers threw Doug's smoking pipe on the front seat. It bounced off, falling in the doorway. Automatically, I reached down to put it back on the seat. At that, Ranger Jack Van Cleve slapped me with tremendous force on the left cheek. As Doug Adair was getting into the car . . . A Ranger kicked his leg, and then slammed the door on it."

A second source of contention was the arrest a few nights later of Magdaleno Dimas and Benito Rodriguez, union members, at the time, on complaint of a La Casita official who said they drove near a packing shed and displayed a rifle in a threatening manner.

In a judicial hearing on La Casita's request for an injunction against union picketing, Mr. Dimas testified that Capt. A. Y. Allee and one of his Rangers arrested the two men inside a house, ordered them outside and then hit them from behind with shotguns as they fled past. Mr. Dimas testified:

"When I pass Mr. Captain Allee is when they hit me, right on my head, to put me down . . . I remember I got up, they hit me again, and put me down again, and I got up, and they hit me right on my neck, and I coming down," Mr. Rodriguez testified that he also was struck from behind and "as I was going down I was struck repeatedly."

Dr. Ramiro R. Casso examined Mr. Dimas the next morning at the request of Mr. McKeithan, the union attorney. Dr. Casso says he found "a cut in back of his head 1½ inches long, and he had developed signs of brain concussion: A persistent headache, nausea, vomiting and dizziness." Another doctor who examined Mr. Dimas earlier at the request of local sheriff's deputies, who participated in the arrest, says the injuries weren't that serious.

Mr. McKeithan says he ordinarily views charges of police brutality "with a grain of salt." But he continues: "What convinced me—I saw them a few hours after the incident. Dimas had obviously been beaten—all sides, front and back. Such a beating hadn't

been necessary even if he had resisted arrest." Mr. Dimas hasn't been charged with resisting arrest. Mr. Nye, the county attorney, says the alleged beating is "of such notoriety" that he will refer it to a special grand jury.

NEWSPERSONS' CHARGES

Newspersons charge the Rangers with hindering legitimate news coverage. Lee Harr, news manager of KGBT-TV, Harlingen, Texas, says he was photographing Ranger arrests of picketers when Ranger Van Cleve told him: "If you want that camera busted just use it again." Felix Ramirez, a professional photographer, says he was taking pictures for the Associated Press when Capt. Allee ordered him to stop, warning: "If you take any more pictures, I'll take your damn camera off of you." Mr. Ramirez stopped taking pictures.

Sen. Williams twice asked that Capt. Allee appear before his subcommittee. Both invitations were declined. After hearings, the Senator said he had heard "a great deal of testimony that Capt. Allee and the Rangers under his direction have trespassed upon private property, have made numerous arrests without legal cause, used physical force far beyond that required to take a subject into custody, participated in acts of strike-breaking and committed other infringements of personal and property rights. That testimony stands uncontradicted by Capt. Allee."

Elsewhere, however, the Rangers vigorously deny all charges against them. "All those charges of brutality—it just didn't happen," growls Capt. Allee, a burly, gravel-voiced man and a Ranger for 35 years. "This damn era we live in now—a man who works to violate the law has more civil rights than good people," he adds. The captain recalls fondly that when he broke in "we were still a horse company." Of course, he adds, "everything's modern now, even crime." Capt. Allee's grandfather and father were Rangers; his son is a Ranger, too.

Answering a suit filed by the Kruegers, the Texas Council of Churches and others, the Rangers deny they have "indulged in any unlawful acts." In the hearing on La Casita's injunction request, Capt. Allee testified that Mr. Dimas and Mr. Rodriguez didn't respond to his order to bring their hands out from under a table to stand up. "I then kicked the table back, and I hit Magdaleno Dimas with the barrel of the shotgun on the head, didn't hurt him, didn't knock him to the floor at that time at all," Capt. Allee said.

Then, the captain added, the two men ran from the room and "they either stumbled over a chair, or something happened to them, I don't know what it was, or tripped and fell down."

Certainly the controversy hasn't damaged the Rangers in the eyes of Col. Garrison, who counts FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover among his friends and who says with emotion that "the greatest tribute I've ever had in my life" was when the Rangers unanimously asked him to become their leader in 1938. To Col. Garrison, a Ranger has what counts for most in a man—courage.

"The Rangers have a great tradition, and their great tradition comes from the fact that a Ranger never retreats," says the colonel. "If it's necessary to die in his tracks, a Ranger dies in his tracks. People know that, and consequently, he seldom has to die in his tracks."

Col. Garrison says proudly that only two Rangers have resigned since 1935. "However, some years ago it became my sad duty to fire a Ranger, because he showed a lack of courage—the only Ranger I've ever fired," he adds.

"What he did was allow himself to be captured by a bank robber. Then he made no attempt to escape. We felt he should have made an attempt to get his gun back. So we fired him for two things. First, he wasn't alert. Second, he showed no guts. His brother

Rangers would never have worked with him after that."

HOOVER'S UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include statistics and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of the United States unfortunately appears to be preoccupied as a social reformer rather than aggressively acting as the chief law enforcement officer of this Nation.

Although the Federal Bureau of Investigation comes under the U.S. Department of Justice, under the able leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI is an efficient organization and has just released its report, "Uniform Crime Reporting."

The Attorney General, as you know, recently said the increase in crime was trivial and not a great problem. Well, I would like to invite his attention to the statistics coming out of the FBI under the Department of Justice and specifically direct his attention to the situation right under his nose here in Washington, D.C. This relates to the first 6 months of this year as compared to the first 6 months of last year. I will cite only a few instances.

As to robberies—there were 800 more robberies in the District of Columbia this year than last year, that is, comparing the first 6 months.

Then here is an appalling statistic—as to burglaries, breaking, and entry, there was an increase of 2,500 in the first 6 months of this year; there was 650 more larcenies; and 1,100 more automobiles were stolen in the first 6 months of 1967.

I think all of you will want to read in detail the statistics that I am including with my remarks, as follows:

UNIFORM CRIME REPORTING (JANUARY-JUNE, 1967)

Crime in the United States as measured by the Crime Index rose 17 percent during the first six months of 1967 over the same period in 1966. The violent crimes as a group increased 18 percent with robbery up 30 percent, murder 20 percent, aggravated assault 11 percent and forcible rape 7 percent. The voluminous property crimes rose 17 percent as a group. Auto theft registered a 19 percent rise, burglary 18 percent and larceny \$50 and over 16 percent. All cities when grouped according to population had crime increases ranging from an average of 7 percent in cities with over one million population to 23 percent in cities having a population of 500,000 to one million. The suburban areas reported an increase of 18 percent and the rural areas were up 15 percent. Geographically, the upward crime trend was consistent throughout the country. Crime in the North Central States rose 20 percent, 18 percent in the Northeastern States and 16 percent in the Southern and Western States. Murder registered the highest percentage increase in the North Central States while in the Southern, Western and Northeastern States the crime of robbery showed the sharpest increase.

TABLE 1.—CRIME INDEX TRENDS (JANUARY-JUNE, PERCENT CHANGE 1967 OVER 1966, OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE)

Population group and area	Number of agencies	Population	Total	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Total, all agencies	4,635	142,749,000	+17	+20	+7	+30	+11	+18	+16	+19
Total, cities over 25,000	804	75,084,000	+17	+25	+9	+30	+10	+17	+15	+19
Suburban area	1,727	45,107,000	+18	+13	+9	+33	+12	+18	+17	+19
Rural area	1,054	20,902,000	+15	+2	-4	+22	+14	+19	+11	+3
Over 1,000,000	4	9,605,000	+7	+30	+6	+17	+6	+6	+7	+3
500,000 to 1,000,000	20	12,540,000	+23	+33	+4	+40	+11	+20	+17	+31
250,000 to 500,000	25	8,722,000	+22	+20	+24	+41	+22	+19	+24	+23
100,000 to 250,000	95	13,706,000	+21	+22	-4	+34	+9	+22	+17	+27
50,000 to 100,000	217	15,089,000	+15	+25	+15	+27	+8	+18	+11	+16
25,000 to 50,000	443	15,422,000	+16	+9	+19	+33	+14	+18	+16	+11
10,000 to 25,000	918	14,362,000	+17	+13	+14	+40	+10	+17	+18	+19
Under 10,000	1,605	8,944,000	+18	+23	+18	+34	+19	+19	+18	+14

TABLE 2.—CRIME INDEX TRENDS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION (JANUARY-JUNE, 1967 OVER 1966)

Region	Total	Murder	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Northeastern States	+18	+25	+8	+28	+14	+18	+10	+26
North Central States	+20	+36	+4	+25	+15	+21	+19	+19
Southern States	+16	+13	+11	+36	+9	+16	+13	+31
Western States	+16	+15	+6	+33	+8	+17	+18	+10

The nationwide rise in aggravated assault included a 24 percent increase in the use of a firearm in these attacks. Armed robbery which comprises 58 percent of the robbery offenses increased 37 percent during the six-month period. Street robbery was up 24 percent, robbery of business houses 39 percent,

service station robbery up 30 percent, chain stores 48 percent and robbery of residences 12 percent. Bank robbery which makes up 1 percent of all robbery showed a 57 percent increase during the six-month period. In the larceny classification purse-snatching showed

a 26 percent increase and theft of personal property from automobiles was up 18 percent. Burglary of residences during the six-month period increased 15 percent over 1966, while non-residency burglary was up 20 percent.

TABLE 3.—OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE, JANUARY THROUGH JUNE, 1966 AND 1967, CITIES OVER 100,000 IN POPULATION

	Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary-breaking or entering	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Abilene, Tex.:							
1966	4	4	4	23	310	220	83
1967		2	3	14	311	231	70
Akron, Ohio:							
1966	5	18	182	84	1,007	832	919
1967	11	25	283	123	1,245	1,114	1,686
Albany, N.Y.:							
1966	1	2	19	34	501	217	277
1967	1	6	45	50	727	205	459
Albuquerque, N. Mex.:							
1966	4	20	97	283	2,079	551	610
1967	5	25	131	236	2,204	1,121	636
Alexandria, Va.:							
1966	1	8	56	162	389	339	166
1967	3	13	89	170	583	392	181
Allentown, Pa.:							
1966	2	1	11	13	187	188	81
1967	1	3	18	9	235	205	87
Amarillo, Tex.:							
1966	5	12	16	127	586	457	171
1967	2	7	38	97	603	584	192
Anaheim, Calif.:							
1966	3	9	35	43	924	591	222
1967	3	12	47	44	1,086	665	279
Arlington, Va.:							
1966	3	11	35	84	644	601	198
1967	2	8	45	120	638	681	288
Atlanta, Ga.:							
1966	61	60	212	468	2,386	2,549	1,130
1967	54	60	268	413	2,659	2,179	1,273
Austin, Tex.:							
1966	8	19	68	222	1,179	374	328
1967	12	21	100	270	1,324	581	384
Baltimore, Md.:							
1966	99	185	2,530	2,887	7,369	5,365	4,372
1967							
Baton Rouge, La.:							
1966	8	18	50	74	1,140	897	327
1967	7	15	60	93	1,344	1,196	440
Beaumont, Tex.:							
1966	7		8	166	425	125	66
1967	6		27	200	585	159	90
Berkeley, Calif.:							
1966	1	24	89	40	843	222	219
1967	1	19	108	40	1,070	362	337
Birmingham, Ala.:							
1966	26	25	138	439	1,872	1,480	573
1967	24	20	147	416	2,243	1,489	744
Boston, Mass.:							
1966	15	55	553	477	2,386	1,525	5,128
1967	36	63	623	548	2,593	1,192	6,799
Bridgeport, Conn.:							
1966	4		33	35	640	370	387
1967	2	1	77	73	878	308	673
Buffalo, N.Y.:							
1966	7	34	128	187	2,376	1,106	1,339
1967	10	41	313	275	2,455	1,450	1,990
Camden, N.J.:							
1966	6	15	100	71	604	285	315
1967		20	193	107	1,007	324	488

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE 3.—OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE, JANUARY THROUGH JUNE, 1966 AND 1967, CITIES OVER 100,000 IN POPULATION—Continued

	Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary- breaking or entering	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Canton, Ohio:							
1966	3	8	24	33	304	309	134
1967	4	5	51	50	388	356	151
Cedar Rapids, Iowa:							
1966		5	8	7	146	181	110
1967		2	6	7	191	155	103
Charlotte, N.C.:							
1966	11	22	158	399	1,377	721	318
1967	26	12	131	407	1,504	907	359
Chattanooga, Tenn.:							
1966	11	11	92	89	1,024	229	514
1967	14	10	104	72	1,051	176	499
Chicago, Ill.:							
1966	196	653	7,868	5,263	14,211	7,955	13,703
1967	273	683	8,298	5,885	15,021	8,202	13,531
Cincinnati, Ohio:							
1966	21	59	168	342	1,544	967	422
1967	28	50	225	357	1,589	1,067	591
Cleveland, Ohio:							
1966	57	62	1,069	508	2,945	540	3,062
1967	79	72	1,716	596	3,807	1,818	5,076
Columbia, S.C.:							
1966	3	4	42	92	617	411	251
1967	9	4	29	138	609	438	370
Columbus, Ga.:							
1966	6	1	19	30	558	283	158
1967	8	5	26	46	590	367	269
Columbus, Ohio:							
1966	9	49	245	256	2,420	1,458	1,155
1967	15	58	366	258	3,369	2,031	1,209
Corpus Christi, Tex.:							
1966	12	12	45	201	1,161	872	252
1967	9	16	82	256	1,303	1,285	314
Dallas, Tex.:							
1966	53	55	307	973	3,578	1,241	1,623
1967	67	65	433	898	4,121	1,287	1,952
Dayton, Ohio:							
1966	11	24	126	196	1,344	499	461
1967	23	39	360	259	1,690	691	779
Dearborn, Mich.:							
1966		2	41	18	481	393	341
1967		5	76	25	477	512	356
Denver, Colo.:							
1966	9	90	310	338	2,826	1,524	1,574
1967	13	90	375	359	3,189	2,122	1,946
Des Moines, Iowa:							
1966	8	8	47	35	484	596	292
1967	3	12	66	25	720	629	387
Detroit, Mich.:							
1966							
1967	111	367	5,391	2,225	17,694	6,728	6,746
Duluth, Minn.:							
1966		1	7	7	290	238	133
1967		2	10	8	474	244	171
Elizabeth, N.J.:							
1966	2	14	74	142	631	226	285
1967		5	74	155	641	255	405
El Paso, Tex.:							
1966	7	21	77	141	1,366	443	474
1967	5	19	102	152	2,023	688	640
Erie, Pa.:							
1966	2	3	29	44	307	178	238
1967	2	4	50	37	537	189	384
Evansville, Ind.:							
1966	5	10	49	102	684	585	300
1967	2	10	61	135	610	559	261
Flint, Mich.:							
1966	4	37	155	588	869	1,066	396
1967	11	33	204	566	1,136	1,352	683
Fort Lauderdale, Fla.:							
1966	3	17	85	123	956	738	270
1967	11	12	98	84	1,108	746	286
Fort Wayne, Ind.:							
1966	3	5	24	37	531	535	200
1967	1	12	59	26	818	789	296
Fort Worth, Tex.:							
1966	21	44	192	244	2,027	716	752
1967	35	36	230	255	2,439	796	1,081
Fresno, Calif.:							
1966	4	5	97	66	1,312	1,010	601
1967	3	6	76	71	1,791	1,033	702
Garden Grove, Calif.:							
1966	2	4	17	64	722	490	179
1967		9	46	45	770	522	211
Gary, Ind.:							
1966	19	43	253	224	763	720	553
1967	19	19	375	216	865	766	730
Glendale, Calif.:							
1966		7	29	27	429	480	259
1967	2	7	36	20	538	641	287
Grand Rapids, Mich.:							
1966	2	10	80	3	973	559	334
1967	6	12	157	109	1,338	586	465
Greensboro, N.C.:							
1966	5	8	33	422	452	443	196
1967	3	11	48	312	470	610	201
Hammond, Ind.:							
1966	2	1	47	49	350	486	280
1967	1	5	73	57	541	558	345
Hampton, Va.:							
1966	3	5	18	34	455	284	56
1967	6	6	17	29	394	195	76
Hartford, Conn.:							
1966	2	12	92	119	833	357	354
1967	17	15	108	151	901	458	698

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE 3.—OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE, JANUARY THROUGH JUNE, 1966 AND 1967, CITIES OVER 100,000 IN POPULATION—Continued

	Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary- breaking or entering	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Honolulu, Hawaii:							
1966	6	6	49	96	2,555	1,099	938
1967	3	7	48	80	2,596	1,276	1,073
Houston, Tex.:							
1966	95	88	1,026	1,254	8,279	2,461	2,618
1967	119	112	1,580	1,246	7,880	3,100	3,263
Huntsville, Ala.:							
1966	3	13	22	157	525	543	248
1967	5	2	4	186	539	533	290
Independence, Mo.:							
1966	2	10	25	57	393	216	93
1967		3	20	74	364	215	83
Indianapolis, Ind.:							
1966	20	58	569	250	2,894	1,215	1,843
1967	26	60	485	218	3,797	1,511	2,284
Jackson, Miss.:							
1966	8		5	53	39	224	116
1967	14	1	19	61	550	258	127
Jacksonville, Fla.:							
1966	11	21	300	218	1,501	836	477
1967	20	33	380	432	1,922	825	510
Jersey City, N.J.:							
1966	8	10	86	85	540	79	1,166
1967	9	12	104	103	497	86	1,468
Kansas City, Kans.:							
1966	7	25	109	131	801	195	294
1967	11	18	220	171	1,275	232	612
Kansas City, Mo.:							
1966	28	99	719	571	3,346	1,925	1,654
1967	32	93	941	625	4,287	2,070	2,319
Knoxville, Tenn.:							
1966	10	11	41	232	948	305	279
1967	8	3	41	154	1,036	391	394
Lansing, Mich.:							
1966	1	9	40	42	471	609	335
1967		8	38	83	663	674	319
Las Vegas, Nev.:							
1966	7	4	92	66	468	349	217
1967	2	3	66	53	506	388	229
Lincoln, Nebr.:							
1966		6	6	51	274	289	90
1967	1	11	6	28	315	266	72
Little Rock, Ark.:							
1966	5	7	72	235	624	714	155
1967	9	13	72	382	790	778	151
Long Beach, Calif.:							
1966	8	53	309	213	2,273	1,382	1,378
1967	7	55	477	247	2,690	1,564	1,316
Los Angeles, Calif.:							
1966	102	653	3,733	4,675	26,773	16,261	11,393
1967	121	700	4,812	5,006	29,165	17,698	11,923
Louisville, Ky.:							
1966	16	29	292	211	1,997	2,002	1,427
1967	28	31	380	313	2,260	2,144	2,175
Lubbock, Tex.:							
1966	7	12	42	127	734	653	152
1967	7	14	46	142	1,029	841	163
Macon, Ga.:							
1966	6	11	60	88	737	291	191
1967	17	11	69	82	832	387	163
Madison, Wis.:							
1966	3	5	12	9	279	377	250
1967		7	13	7	383	513	221
Memphis, Tenn.:							
1966	10	34	236	90	3,207	2,267	725
1967	27	53	354	219	3,962	1,979	957
Miami, Fla.:							
1966	27	42	682	1,191	3,464	1,644	768
1967	24	48	731	1,255	3,412	1,832	944
Milwaukee, Wis.:							
1966	13	13	82	197	1,319	1,963	1,700
1967	17	23	231	260	1,785	2,452	2,382
Minneapolis, Minn.:							
1966	18	40	440	349	3,403	1,724	1,635
1967	6	72	587	644	4,362	1,661	1,590
Mobile, Ala.:							
1966	3	10	79	192	1,502	553	309
1967	7	17	95	255	1,503	596	350
Montgomery, Ala.:							
1966	12	7	36	36	578	485	151
1967	12	9	54	31	744	524	167
Nashville, Tenn.:							
1966	19	48	109	457	2,054	1,399	790
1967	25	55	255	730	3,041	1,721	1,432
Newark, N.J.:							
1966	26	62	731	962	4,625	1,963	2,209
1967	28	80	827	980	4,635	2,077	2,500
New Bedford, Mass.:							
1966	1	2	23	35	406	179	372
1967	1	4	42	49	569	298	684
New Haven, Conn.:							
1966	2	4	15	62	581	295	477
1967	5	3	25	70	1,045	329	694
New Orleans, La.:							
1966	57	89	631	614	3,326	2,410	2,287
1967	62	94	1,002	790	3,879	3,299	3,020
Newport News, Va.:							
1966	5	4	68	109	412	243	106
1967	7	10	47	105	576	408	151
New York, N.Y.:							
1966							
1967							
Niagara Falls, N.Y.:							
1966	346	929	16,041	13,609	68,693	54,645	23,341
1967	1	4	25	92	290	305	104
		4	46	116	349	319	160

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE 3.—OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE, JANUARY THROUGH JUNE, 1966 AND 1967, CITIES OVER 100,000 IN POPULATION—Continued

	Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary- breaking or entering	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Norfolk, Va.:							
1966	11	16	175	401	1,608	958	750
1967	20	42	276	351	2,006	1,551	761
Oakland, Calif.:							
1966	18	32	474	264	2,847	1,638	979
1967	14	55	663	305	4,102	2,354	1,328
Oklahoma City, Okla.:							
1966	15	35	248	143	1,831	283	760
1967	21	58	174	253	2,166	814	656
Omaha, Nebr.:							
1966	5	22	99	24	1,351	306	823
1967	13	31	208	257	1,557	580	734
Orlando, Fla.:							
1966	7	16	55	173	671	502	192
1967	9	3	64	147	542	599	311
Pasadena, Calif.:							
1966	3	19	78	66	964	541	294
1967	5	16	112	92	1,128	714	282
Paterson, N.J.:							
1966	8	5	84	45	594	88	450
1967	6	8	107	80	718	153	542
Peoria, Ill.:							
1966	5	14	90	74	803	348	332
1967	4	10	147	90	677	351	272
Philadelphia, Pa.:							
1966	87	239	1,181	1,944	5,605	2,303	3,492
1967	113	238	1,429	1,749	6,136	2,098	3,334
Phoenix, Ariz.:							
1966	18	58	244	337	3,216	2,731	1,477
1967	23	53	354	432	4,497	2,906	1,828
Pittsburgh, Pa.:							
1966	13	92	779	337	2,938	1,942	2,689
1967	16	89	862	430	2,957	2,192	3,525
Portsmouth, Va.:							
1966	5	4	114	78	762	356	254
1967	12	6	97	85	886	364	288
Providence, R.I.:							
1966	4	6	61	102	1,037	324	1,166
1967	7	7	87	123	1,397	369	1,580
Pueblo, Colo.:							
1966	3	-----	18	41	217	278	77
1967	2	3	16	75	338	356	122
Raleigh, N.C.:							
1966	6	5	28	235	455	395	119
1967	3	4	40	165	417	511	145
Reading, Pa.:							
1966	1	1	15	17	341	113	104
1967	2	1	25	37	341	128	161
Richmond, Va.:							
1966	24	39	132	207	1,588	758	869
1967	23	35	195	229	1,742	487	930
Riverside, Calif.:							
1966	3	15	30	115	946	729	277
1967	1	13	52	91	1,171	856	294
Roanoke, Va.:							
1966	1	5	24	108	476	237	174
1967	6	4	26	85	539	436	248
Rochester, N.Y.:							
1966	14	17	60	128	1,169	820	584
1967	12	32	166	268	1,481	1,003	451
Rockford, Ill.:							
1966	5	2	25	22	339	287	126
1967	3	-----	48	47	394	364	154
Sacramento, Calif.:							
1966	5	18	172	98	1,675	1,068	1,121
1967	15	18	178	94	1,452	1,085	935
Saginaw, Mich.:							
1966	6	9	91	78	340	153	232
1967	7	7	72	119	461	126	130
St. Louis, Mo.:							
1966	47	155	1,058	1,009	6,080	1,230	2,335
1967	90	114	1,331	1,091	6,169	1,494	3,156
St. Paul, Minn.:							
1966	7	39	190	173	1,919	914	1,010
1967	4	30	258	186	2,489	1,256	1,302
St. Petersburg, Fla.:							
1966	7	24	140	269	1,073	639	171
1967	5	9	136	157	1,297	701	224
Salt Lake City, Utah:							
1966	3	13	102	65	1,120	1,035	483
1967	2	12	142	85	1,292	1,063	383
San Antonio, Texas:							
1966	26	44	163	616	4,121	1,977	1,227
1967	38	53	224	723	3,653	2,074	1,121
San Bernardino, Calif.:							
1966	-----	8	54	54	846	586	279
1967	-----	13	69	56	1,050	860	285
San Diego, Calif.:							
1966	4	28	175	289	1,618	2,746	1,060
1967	4	31	211	276	1,779	3,318	1,084
San Francisco, Calif.:							
1966	19	43	1,180	923	5,569	1,975	3,669
1967	34	78	1,721	1,061	7,543	2,366	4,592
San Jose, Calif.:							
1966	8	29	76	56	1,907	473	724
1967	4	24	110	84	2,130	568	823
Santa Ana, Calif.:							
1966	3	11	39	81	567	236	185
1967	1	15	50	86	834	319	252
Savannah, Ga.:							
1966	8	9	126	306	601	540	165
1967	8	14	120	63	868	613	255
Scranton, Pa.:							
1966	1	-----	6	24	286	81	113
1967	-----	1	9	46	330	89	165
Seattle, Wash.:							
1966	15	62	270	171	2,331	2,193	995
1967	20	51	554	348	3,663	2,924	1,655

TABLE 3.—OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE, JANUARY THROUGH JUNE, 1966 AND 1967, CITIES OVER 100,000 IN POPULATION—Continued

	Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary- breaking or entering	Larceny, \$50 and over	Auto theft
Shreveport, La.:							
1966	12	4	45	223	506	212	262
1967	8	5	28	273	661	275	324
South Bend, Ind.:							
1966	3	6	30	23	444	194	220
1967	2	2	57	41	809	291	295
Spokane, Wash.:							
1966	2	4	20	16	479	235	233
1967	1	3	31	19	467	337	297
Springfield, Mass.:							
1966	2	2	4	5	211	261	435
1967	7	3	31	82	496	172	759
Springfield, Mo.:							
1966	1	4	16	14	391	148	67
1967	1		12	7	446	187	73
Syracuse, N.Y.:							
1966	1	20	80	198	853	810	203
1967	6	34	141	220	1,115	1,096	276
Tacoma, Wash.:							
1966	2	9	25	60	533	320	217
1967	5	9	54	119	662	494	284
Tampa, Fla.:							
1966	15	23	251	394	2,335	1,295	558
1967	13	24	347	404	2,982	1,503	674
Topeka, Kans.:							
1966	1	7	31	87	358	193	74
1967		4	39	121	504	279	159
Torrance, Calif.:							
1966	3	10	43	51	820	815	293
1967		13	57	46	910	1,074	395
Trenton, N.J.:							
1966	4	21	151	79	645	159	555
1967	8	10	165	111	892	357	745
Tucson, Ariz.:							
1966	3	23	50	120	1,032	591	514
1967	4	12	71	112	1,158	709	399
Tulsa, Okla.:							
1966	6	32	65	87	1,184	1,135	432
1967	10	30	103	165	1,475	1,307	692
Utica, N.Y.:							
1966		1	10	11	139	85	54
1967	1	1	14	13	196	40	52
Virginia Beach, Va.:							
1966	2	9	17	104	330	316	95
1967	1	5	18	71	437	493	108
Waco, Tex.:							
1966	2	7	30	228	868	308	88
1967	5	10	43	155	700	305	114
Warren, Mich.:							
1966		8	37	64	582	602	223
1967	2	11	44	156	819	743	262
Washington, D.C.:							
1966	74	69	1,466	1,449	4,574	2,349	2,582
1967	88	85	2,666	1,509	7,067	3,016	3,611
Waterbury, Conn.:							
1966	1	2	22	28	359	214	205
1967	3	3	28	28	536	218	217
Wichita, Kans.:							
1966	5	20	50	132	868	627	391
1967	5	28	54	177	1,136	910	569
Wichita Falls, Tex.:							
1966	5	3	13	82	205	163	103
1967		2	17	123	207	147	97
Winston-Salem, N.C.:							
1966	7	6	42	460	553	281	153
1967	15	4	54	457	703	336	209
Worcester, Mass.:							
1966	2	9	91	46	1,223	463	801
1967	1	13	51	52	1,115	542	1,033
Yonkers, N.Y.:							
1966	4	1	36	59	566	550	404
1967	2	3	56	114	664	654	479
Youngstown, Ohio:							
1966	4	7	64	77	484	164	307
1967	9	2	135	116	718	213	575

1966 figures not comparable with 1967.

Note: All 1967 crime figures from reporting units are preliminary. Final figures are published in annual report.

NO MORE FEES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include pertinent extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, opposition continues to grow in regard to the variety of admission fees, boat dock fees, guide fees, and various other fees that have been imposed at our Federal reservoirs by the Johnson administration. Surely the time has come for this matter to be considered by the Congress through the

vehicle of H.R. 11236, now pending before the House Public Works Committee.

In that vein, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article by Bill Potter, outdoor editor of the Joplin, Mo., Globe:

POTTERING AROUND WITH BILL POTTER

An item appearing on the sports pages of The Joplin Globe of August 16 gave this newsman a jolt.

The same news account caused a flashback in time, perhaps as much as 55 years.

As I read the Associated Press article with the Washington dateline it was not the shock of the facts in the story that startled me but rather the alleged explanation of the subject contained in the release.

Across my mind raced a scene from childhood days. I couldn't have been more than eight years of age. I recall it was one of

those delightful adventures when my dad would take me fishing with him.

On this particular day dad waxed philosophical. It was 1912 and William Howard Taft was in the White House. Dad was a militant Republican. In those days we lived in a great society but there was no "Great Society." The home was the important unit of the nation in that era and it took no man in a gray flannel suit from Madison Avenue to coin a phrase such as "the family that plays together, stays together." That was an era when the family prayed and played together and stayed together. It was a nation of families living in a sound economy and believing in a Lincolnian form of government that was "of the people, for the people and by the people."

Dad was doing real well with his fishing that day. He had caught quite a string of

bass and crappie and bream plus a catfish or two. I was too busy catching worm-stealing perch to catch the significance of a statement he made at that time. I can't give an exact quote but the essence of his statement came back quite forcefully the other day when I read the story from the "Great Society" capitol of 1967. This, I think, is the way dad put it that sunny Saturday afternoon:

"William, this is something that will always be free. Not even the government will invade your right of free access to the water. Fishing is a sport for all the people. God meant it this way because many of our poor people depend upon this fish for their food. As long as there is water and those waters shelter fish, this will be free for all people."

My dad is gone and so is his dream.

Of course those words were spoken probably before the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ever decided that they would dam up most of our free-flowing rivers, build mammoth impoundments and then step-by-step and little by little flaunting their authority upon the people.

That's the story I'm talking about—the Associated Press dispatch of August 15 in which the Corps issued its "pay-or-else" edict to dock owners and other such installations on America's 230 lakes under their tenacious control. Deadline for "else" is Jan. 1. That's the date under this latest imposition that owners of such installations start paying rent to the government.

So the "grabbing for the green" boys are at it again. Never satisfied. Just greedy.

Let it be said, however, that the officials of the Corps are getting their orders from the higher ups in the executive branch. I suspect the "higher up" in this case might be the man from Arizona who heads up the Dept. of Interior, Stewart Udall.

Little by little my dad's prophecy of fishing for free has swung the other way until now it becomes fishing for a fee.

There are many angles to which this infringement of personal rights might be attacked. But with so many of our citizens bordering on the apathetic and fearful of "big government," we suspect the millions who pursue the sports of boating, fishing, cruising, skiing or just plan living "on the lake," will remain silent and pick up the tab.

My primary concern in this particular column (and there will be more, let me assure you now) is a statement of explanation made by a Corps spokesman when commenting on the fee to be imposed on the folks who have private docks, duck blinds, private or semi-private fishing piers, etc.

Here is the explanation and it bugs me, neighbor, really bugs me:

"The fees are designed to give adequate compensation to the government for granting private interests a valuable right to use public property."

That's what the man said.

Now, let me say something!

Just who in the hell does that spokesman think paid for that "public property" in the first place. Who's kidding who about what? I realize it is not too gentlemanly to show your ire in public but this is one of those times when it seems to me we ought to practice the slogan we use to try out new type-writer ribbons and improve our touch typing when we write, "Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the party."

If the sportsmen and property owners of this nation lack the guts to stand on their two feet and protest these impositions of rights then they ought to pay through the nose and admit that Mr. Lincoln was wrong and it's not a government "for the people" nor "by the people."

If the fraternity of folks who utilize our great impoundments and parks—paid for by their tax dollars—don't speak up now and demand the Congress and the "Great Society" brass tone down their green grabbin' tactics by (1) repealing the big deal that

started this whole vicious circle of making the people pay for enjoying that which they have already paid for, "Operation Golden Eagle," (2) the recent order of the Corps concerning the limitations of licensed guides and (3) the more recent fee farce that imposes "rental" on lake installations, then those hot little hands of the fee fanatics will reach out for more until there isn't anything left to "fee" and that would just about drive them nuts.

Maybe it's time for another Boston tea party. Those patriots were mad about taxation without representation. The new edition could well be a "fee" party. The preliminaries could start now and the main show could be held in 1968 at the ballot boxes in every precinct of our land. We could let our elected officials of the various branches of government, especially the executive and legislative branches, understand that if they are not willing to stand up and be counted on our side and will not tell the Corps to head in and halt this fee-grabbin' gimmick, then those who seek election to the Congress or to some executive branch of the capitol's capers, had better not plan on living in Washington.

Let me use a bit more of today's column space and dare you to write your Congressman and your two senators and tell them how you feel about this fee fuss. And, when the politicians solicit your vote in 1968 (a bonus year for the voters when they can start right at the top) let them know you want the proper representation in Congress and part of that proper representation consists of eradicating these fee impositions being ordered by whoever it is that tells the U.S. Corps of Engineers what to do.

Perhaps this is the time when a Martin Luther should arise from the fraternity of outdoor enthusiasts and tack on the doors of Congress the demands for a modern reformation.

Nor would a 1957 Patrick Henry be out of order. Certainly there's a cry of warning that needs be shouted.

And if the leaders of our Great Society wanna talk about "Head Start," let them read of the head start the Central Crossing Association has recently given in protest to the latest Corps edict. Some 23,000 names were signed to petitions requesting the House Public Works Commission to study "the entire recreation policy of the U.S. Corps of Engineers." Hooray for Howard McIlrath and that organization's move to initiate a modern-day inquisition.

They keep telling us we must fight to preserve the freedom we have.

It seems that it's also time to do a bit of fighting to keep the big boys from taking away what freedoms we are supposed to have—like a little water recreation fun for free. Huh!

IS OEO REALLY NECESSARY?

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, from its past performance, is the OEO really necessary? That is a question I believe we should seriously consider before giving this organization any additional funds or authority. There have been numerous unanswered charges of failure in OEO programs as well as charges of the use of OEO as a partisan political vehicle.

Recently a situation in my own community, Memphis, raises the question of

the competency of some OEO officials and their right to be employed in public service. Here are some facts I have gathered as a result of a personal investigation.

The University of Tennessee, College of Medicine at Memphis, made a valiant attempt to initiate a neighborhood clinic program in Memphis. The university's medical school has a long record of worthy achievement in Memphis in serving the medically indigent. The number of people who come to the emergency room of the John Gaston Hospital and the Gailor Clinics is so enormous that it virtually inundates the staff and facilities. The only possible way to resolve the problem, run a more orderly hospital, and render more acceptable services to the patients is to decentralize the services and set up a number of neighborhood clinics.

After lengthy consultation with the county medical society and much thought and effort on the part of the health department of Shelby County, the college of medicine, and the Shelby County Poverty Committee, a grant application was submitted last spring by the university to set up neighborhood clinics. In the preparatory phases of the application, the Office of Economic Opportunity sent a consultant to Memphis, presumably hired on a contractual basis from a business firm in Connecticut. The consultant suggested certain additions in the application for neighborhood clinics such as day care services for the children of patients, homemaker education programs for the mothers and training programs for paramedical personnel within the neighborhood clinic. While all of these proposals are desirable, they are not necessary additions for the purely medical operation of a neighborhood clinic.

In July the university received a notice from Dr. John M. Frankel, director of the health division of the community action program, OEO, that the application had been turned down due to lack of funds. However, at the same time OEO had approved 41 such applications including grants for Nashville and Chattanooga, both much smaller communities and certainly with no greater need than Memphis. OEO also approved a second grant for Denver, Colo.

It is evident the application from Memphis was turned down because the medical college did not agree to become involved in operations beyond the scope of a medical clinic to serve the immediate needs of the poor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out an almost unbelievable attitude on the part of the OEO office charged with the responsibility for medical programs for the poor. When the grant application for a neighborhood clinic was turned down, officials of the Memphis Medical College called Dr. Frankel and asked for an opportunity to discuss the application. They were informed by Dr. Frankel that everyone in his office was going on vacation at that time and after that they were going to a meeting in Chicago or Detroit, and that they were all tired. For these reasons Dr. Frankel indicated no meeting could be held on the Memphis application at that time and if such a meeting were held, OEO would decide

when and where. It is now the middle of September and the Memphis people have not had a single word from Dr. Frankel or any other official of the Health Division of OEO. It would seem that 2 months should give the personnel in this office sufficient time to rest up from their vacations to resume the responsibilities of their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, is it not proper for us to ask how interested these people really are in medical care for the poor? What kind of an operation is it which closes down completely so its workers can all take vacations at the same time? How much concern do these people have for the poor and the sick when they cannot take time to review an application for funds to bring medical care to the medically indigent because they, the bureaucrats, are too tired?

I say it is past time for a complete investigation of OEO and such branches as the Health Division. It is time Congress takes action to make sure that the money we appropriate for taking care of the poor is used for that purpose and not merely to maintain a bureaucracy where interdepartment conventions and vacations and time to rest up from vacations is more important than the welfare of the sick and the poor.

FOUR VESSELS FLYING THE BRITISH FLAG CALLED ON NORTH VIETNAM DURING AUGUST

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified that the House yesterday insisted that no defense funds should be used to construct any naval vessels in foreign shipyards. This action which was directed at barring the British from building 16 minesweepers is consistent with new prohibitions written into the foreign aid authorization bill by the House just a few weeks ago providing that no defense articles shall be acquired from any country which permits ships under its registry to transport any supplies to or from North Vietnam. Since the vote yesterday indicated some may have reservations about the wisdom of this policy, I take the time to advise my colleagues that according to information just made available to me by the Department of Defense during August—just last month—six free world flag ships called on North Vietnam. Four of these vessels flew the British flag. These included the *Rochford* and the *Taipeieng*. The latter ship is a tanker of some 8,800 deadweight tons and while the nature of its cargo is classified, one could not speculate for long about its contents. The names of the other two ships are also classified. This brings the total number of British-flag ship arrivals to North Vietnam during 1967 to 41.

Now I am aware that the apologists for this British-flag shipping argue that these vessels are owned and operated by Hong Kong concerns some of which are,

in fact, controlled by Communist Chinese. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that they fly the British flag and are registered in accordance with British law. It is British law that permits this. It is nothing more than an arrangement to rent the British flag to those who find it to their advantage to have one. The question of what steps must be taken to effectively stop this type of aid and comfort to the Hanoi regime is one for the British to answer. Until they do, I cannot see why the Congress should be too concerned about the British building 16 minesweepers for the U.S. Navy.

However, the problems of the British should in no way dissuade us in our efforts to bring an end to this aid to the enemy.

The British have used extraordinary measures to cut off trade with Rhodesia. I say it is time that they become more concerned about the trade they are aiding and abetting with North Vietnam.

WILL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE "STAY AWAKE"?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the highly respected journalist, Mr. David Lawrence, has put the meaning of the Vietnam war in proper context in his editorial in the U.S. News & World Report for September 18, 1967. The theme of the editorial should be imprinted in the memories of those who are concerned about the security of free men:

Most people are not aware of what the Vietnam war means. They continue to assume that the conflict is something into which the Government has stumbled just to assist one nation to repel the aggression of another. The American people have not yet been aroused to the dangers of the Communist conspiracy, whose menacing hand is reaching into nearly every part of the globe.

This editorial by Mr. Lawrence should be read, reread and thoroughly digested. The presence of the international conspiracy of communism explains why Vietnamese Communists butcher fellow Vietnamese; why Chinese Communists decimated literally millions of their Chinese brothers; why Hungarian Communists, with the help of the Soviets, mowed down thousands of Hungarian patriots in 1956; why Korean Communists could slaughter fellow Korean civilians during the Korean war.

Never in all recorded history has one single motivating force turned one countryman against another in mankind's greatest bloodbath. Yet today learned men shout for a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam and whisper not a word against the enslavement of communism's millions. Others hesitate not an instant to call the U.S. role in Vietnam immoral, but 50 years of communism's inhumanity to man have passed by and they have still to take the moral initiative against it.

With Mr. Lawrence, I prayerfully hope that the American people, despite the

sincere but dangerous statements of some men of reputation, will be alert and call upon their sense of justice and self-preservation to extend further the areas of freedom throughout the world.

I include the editorial of Mr. David Lawrence, from the September 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report in the RECORD at this point:

WILL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE "STAY AWAKE"?

(By David Lawrence)

Back in 1940, John F. Kennedy wrote a book, entitled "Why England Slept," in which he traced the mood of indifference in the 1930s as England failed to recognize the threat of Hitlerism and instead continually curtailed armament expenditures.

Today it is feared that America may be "sleeping" while the menace of two nations—both nuclear-equipped—grows in intensity. The United States meanwhile gropes in futility for some comfort out of a treaty that would merely bar other nations from developing the nuclear weapons which Red China and the Soviet Union have already learned how to make.

Do the American people know the true meaning of the Communist menace? Or do they think the Vietnam war is simply a colossal blunder by which American troops have been dragged into fighting against a small nation in Southeast Asia?

For it isn't generally realized just what the relationship is between the Vietnam war and the safety of the United States itself.

Many Americans have forgotten the periodic news reports from different parts of the world in the last few years disclosing the activities of Communist infiltrators—and, indeed, in the case of Cuba, the actual building and equipping of missile bases by the Soviets within 90 miles of our own sea coast.

The realistic fact is that the United States is not yet providing adequate defenses against the contingency of a nuclear attack. Not only have we failed to set up a new program to build more Polaris and nuclear-attack submarines, but we have dilly-dallied about the construction of an antiballistic-missile system. This is happening even while the Soviet Union is expanding its naval power, including nuclear submarines, and is deploying its own ABM system around its cities.

Official Washington seems to believe it can persuade the Soviets not to increase armament expenditures but to adopt an attitude of self-restraint, although all signs thus far clearly show the men in the Kremlin are continuing to reach out for world power not only through Southeast Asia but through the Middle East.

This is not the time to turn away from substantial spending for defense. For the security of the United States is certainly more important than the comforts of the "Great Society."

The conspiracy of Communist imperialism aims to gain control of the avenues of world commerce by dominating vital areas. Its efforts have been thwarted in Indonesia, and will be checkmated in Southeast Asia if the Vietnam war is successfully prosecuted by the United States and its allies. But what does the Soviet intrigue among the Arab nations mean? Why has the Suez Canal been closed, even though this has been hurting Egypt considerably?

As was pointed out in the August 28 issue of this magazine, in an article entitled "Now A New Ocean For U.S. To Defend," the United States is confronted with new problems in the waters from Africa to Australia, where Polaris-submarine bases are needed, in case of attack, "to give the U.S. an 'angle' it does not now have on Russian and Red Chinese targets." America must, moreover, fill the gap in what experts describe as a "communications-blackout area" in the Indian Ocean

in order to monitor Soviet and Red Chinese space and missile activities.

American policy in Vietnam is regarded by the Communists as in a critical stage today. For if, as Moscow and Peking hope, the United States tries to wiggle out of Vietnam, the pressure by the Communists in Africa and Asia, as well as in Europe, will be intensified. The Communists still maintain a headquarters in Cuba from which they send agitators trained in guerrilla warfare to make trouble in Venezuela, Colombia and other Latin-American countries.

Too many Americans forget that Communism is a worldwide apparatus. The Vietnam war is just a part of the global mechanism which the Communists have set up in order to achieve control over the vast underdeveloped areas whose resources will increase in importance as the Soviets provide funds to develop them.

The United States cannot afford to "sleep" while the Communist imperialists are watching for every opportunity to make more gains.

Most people are not aware of what the Vietnam war means. They continue to assume that the conflict is something into which the Government has stumbled just to assist one nation to repel the aggression of another. The American people have not yet been aroused to the dangers of the Communist conspiracy, whose menacing hand is reaching into nearly every part of the globe.

May we prayerfully hope that no book will ever have to be written telling a tragic story of "What Happened When America Slept"!

MEDICINE'S NOT SO SILENT PARTNER

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Member of this body, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DURWARD G. HALL, occupies the valuable position in Congress of being both effective and energetic legislator and physician. From these dual specialties, he has often provided an insight into problems facing the Nation which few of us can have.

I wish today to insert in the RECORD a speech by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], "Medicine's Not So Silent Partner" given before the Annual Conference of State Medical Associations on June 17, 1967.

The gentleman from Missouri discusses the partnership between members of the medical profession and the Government and concludes:

I am still convinced that cooperation is the best road to travel, but cooperation which must be in its best and truest and fullest meaning. It must work both ways, and those representing quality care of patients must have the guts to stand for belief and principle.

What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] has to say needs to be heard. The trends and "fouls" need to be made clear and I include the speech in full at this point:

MEDICINE'S NOT-SO-SILENT PARTNER

(By the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL, M.D., Congressman, Seventh Missouri Congressional District)

Since that crucial vote in the U.S. House of Representatives on April 8, 1965 when 286

House members defeated 191 opponents of federal medicine and Medicare started on its way—our profession has been asked by the federal government officials to join in partnership with the federal government, which is building bridges these days.

Leaders in all branches of Medicine freely offered their time and experience attending advisory committee meetings held in Washington, D.C. and Baltimore. Even some of the most liberal members of the radio, television, press, and periodical world who had been chewing on physicians for 20 years commended the professions new attitude of cooperation.

I, for one, urged cooperation then, and I urge it now, but its time to blow the whistle at the *fouls* being committed by Medicine's new "partner," or "intervener," the federal government. I know of no other profession, group or industry, certainly not labor, not the legal profession, not the professional chemists, or the professional engineers, who in spite of their good works and contributions to society, are the victims of such malicious invectives and accusations, as is the medical profession.

THE SUBTLE HAND

In spite of being the only group which is subject to the draft up to age 35, in spite of the fact that many physicians give so generously of their time caring for the indigent, on unpaid hospital and other medical committees and boards, in medical missions in Vietnam and throughout the entire world, there is a growing long list of current smears, legal actions, punitive investigations, and intended regulations, some of which I will cite, and all of which demonstrate that with a friendly partner like this, who needs enemies?

Let me cite a few examples. . . . The Medicare law's legislative author, Mr. Mills, guaranteed on the floor of the House of Representatives that the Social Security Administration would not use the new law to disturb existing patterns of medical practice. Yet Mr. Ball, the Administrator, now proposes that hospital-based physicians, especially the pathologists and radiologists, become employees of hospitals.

. . . During the testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee prior to passage of the legislation HEW officials vowed they wanted only to cover the 65 and older members of society, yet in the first session of Congress following enactment of the law, coverage of the disabled is requested—irrespective of whether such person is able to afford his own medical expenses.

. . . Though the law guaranteed two modes of payment for physicians, i.e., direct billing using receipted bill, or by the assignment method, just three weeks ago while organized labor stumped the nation and filled the press with charges that organized Medicine was ruining the program by not using the assignment route exclusively.

HEW officials, behind closed committee doors, sought to require a statement by the physician on his receipted bill that charges shown were his total charges, thus permitting the federal government to exercise fixed-fee-control over any physician in the Medicare program. This isn't "keeping the faith, baby," if you ask me. HEW's own testimony shows about half the doctors have used assignment during the first six months of the program.

PROPAGANDA AT TAXPAYER'S EXPENSE

. . . Disregarding the advice of the medical profession, our fair-weather partner sends its emissaries throughout the land, at the taxpayer's expense, in support of the use of "generic-drugs-only" in welfare programs.

. . . Pro-administration Senators Philip Hart and Gaylord Nelson, who possess not a single hour of medical credit in their educational background, and whose professional staff rosters fail to include any medically

trained personnel unless you count hangers-on of the Kefauver inquisition as such, tell the American people, who have the finest medical system in the world, that physicians must:

a. Turn over to the optometrists some elements of care and treatment of the eye.

b. Must relinquish to the druggists the right to select from their stocks of generic drugs the drug of the company which offers to the druggist the highest mark up.

c. They would deny physicians the right to prescribe either a generic or trade name drug.

. . . Now Webster defines partner as—an associate; sharer; participant. The federal government is hardly living up to its role in this definition when its OEO opens neighborhood clinics in cities where the local medical society's notice of the event is seen for the first time in a copy of the evening paper of the day of the grand opening. This has happened in several places—most recently, in my own state, in Kansas City. Nor is the government playing the game when, in its demonstration cities' legislation there is provided mortgage guarantees wherein preference is given to those groups who offer prepaid care. These usually are labor organizations plans wherein physicians are hired on a salary and their earnings exploited in a way contrary to medical ethics.

"PROFIT" TAXES ON REVENUES

. . . Nor is the federal government a friendly partner when in return for such good deeds as the voluntary Vietnam Medic Program for the civilians of that war torn country, its Commissioner of Internal Revenue proposed regulations to tax at the rate of 48 per cent net, advertising revenue of national and state medical journals and the journals and magazines of nearly every cultural organization in this country including the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, the American Bar Association, the American Farm Bureau, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and I could go on naming some 600 educational, scientific, service, and cultural organizations whose members are from the professions, business, and labor.

These proposed regulations are based upon a 1950 (17 year old) law originally enacted by Congress to curb the abuse of tax free universities owning and operating manufacturing businesses in competition with tax paying businesses.

Our friendly partner's IRS has recently notified the Student American Medical Association that it is recommending withdrawal of the Association's status as a tax exempt organization. IRS says the group derives most of its income from advertising revenue in its magazine, the *New Physician*, and from sales of life insurance to its members.

Though we all know that voluntary community blood banks are organized "not for profit," and reduces costs of medically needed blood, yet our "friendly" partner's FTC claims they are a business, and in interstate commerce, and therefore are subject to the antitrust laws.

FIRST STEP IN HARASSMENT

Our friendly partner's Justice Department has filed a civil antitrust suit charging the College of American Pathologists and its members with conspiring to monopolize the medical laboratory testing industry by price-fixing and forcing laboratories, owned by nonmembers, out of business by what it called "boycotting agreements." As you know the College pointed out that the timing of this action, coming as the inception of Medicare and immediately following the AMA Annual Meeting, makes it appear that this is but the first step in a campaign of harassment of the entire medical profession by the government.

There are times when the American public can hardly escape the conclusion that the Administration in power is deliberately out to destroy the good name of the American

physician, and to make him a subject of ridicule and contempt. For those who in one pious breath attack "McCarthyism" and in the other breath use such broad brush methods of innuendo, there is a double standard of immense contradictions.

I am still convinced that cooperation is the best road to travel, but cooperation which must be in its best and truest and fullest meaning. It must work both ways, and those representing quality care of patients must have the guts to stand for belief and principle.

JOHN BARRY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, often called the father of the American Navy, John Barry served our country early, long, and well. On the 13th of September 1803, this great hero of the Revolutionary War died at the age of 58 in Philadelphia. His career entitles him to the respect and admiration of all Americans.

Born at Ballysampion, Tacumshane Parish, County Wexford, Ireland, he went to sea as a boy, and about 1760 settled in Philadelphia, where he eventually became a notably successful shipmaster and later a shipowner. In 1776, he espoused the cause of the Colonies against British oppression and was placed in command of the brig *Lexington* by the Continental Congress.

On April 7, 1776, he captured the British sloop, *Edward*. This was the first capture in actual battle of a British warship by a regularly commissioned American cruiser. Barry's dispatch, headed "In sight of the Capes of Virginia, April 7, 1776," was addressed to the Marine Committee of the Continental Congress:

I have the pleasure to acquaint you—

He wrote—

that at one P.M. this day I fell in with the sloop *Edward*, belonging to the *Liverpool* frigate. She engaged us for near two [hour-] glasses. They killed two of our men, and wounded two more. We shattered her in a terrible manner as you will see. We killed and wounded several of her crew. I shall give you a particular account of the powder and arms taken out of her, as well as my proceedings in general. I have the pleasure to acquaint you, that all our people behaved with much courage.

Barry brought the *Edward* as a prize into Philadelphia. He had demonstrated the ability of the colonists to contest the sea with British vessels, something many leaders of the patriot cause had doubted could be done.

Barry even volunteered for duty with the American Army, and participated with distinction in the Trenton campaign. He was then given command of the *Raleigh* with which he fought a gallant battle on September 25, 1778, in Penobscot Bay against superior British naval forces. He finally was obliged to beach his ship, but saved most of his men from capture.

Taking out letters of marque from the State of Pennsylvania, he assumed com-

mand of the brig *Delaware* on February 15, 1779. He made two cruises to Haiti, and captured the British sloop *Harlem*.

His most successful cruise started on February 11, 1781, when he sailed from Boston for France commanding the *Alliance*, the American Navy's largest and finest vessel. He captured the *Alert* en route. He put down a mutiny, and then captured the *Mars* and *Minerva*. After a fierce engagement, he forced the two British brigs, the *Atalanta* and the *Trepassey*, to strike their colors. Barry was badly wounded in the action.

To Barry belongs the distinction of having fought the last naval action of the War for Independence. Aboard the *Alliance*, he arrived at Martinique early in January of 1783. On the return voyage, he encountered the *Sybil*, a British frigate, on March 10. His first mate, John Kessler, wrote as follows about the battle between the two vessels:

Captain Barry went from gun to gun on the main deck, cautioning against too much haste and not to fire until the enemy was right abreast. He ordered the main topsail hove to the mast so that the enemy (who had already fired a bow gun, the shot of which struck into the cabin of the *Alliance*) might come up as soon as he was abreast, when the action began, and before a half hour her guns were silenced and nothing but musketry was fired from her. She appeared very much injured in her hull. She was of thirty-two guns and appeared very full of men, and after an action of forty-five minutes she sheared off. Our injured were, I think, three killed and eleven wounded (three of whom died of their wounds) and one sail and rigging cut.

John Barry's service to his country did not end with the winning of the Revolution.

In 1794, when the Congress of the United States ordered the construction of six frigates to combat the depredations of Algerian pirates, Barry was named senior captain and placed in command of the *United States*, being as was said, "of all the naval captains—the one who possessed the greatest reputation for experience, conduct, and skill."

During hostilities with France, Barry was placed in command of all the American naval forces in West Indian waters. He remained there until the beginning of May 1799. In December of that year, he escorted American envoys to France. On his return, he took command of the *Guadaloupe* station in the West Indies, a post he retained until 1801. He died 2 years later at the head of the U.S. Navy.

On this anniversary of his death, we salute the memory of a great man, a great naval leader, and a great Irish American, Commodore John Barry.

EULOGY TO ERNEST HENDERSON, SR.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the

passing of a man like Ernest Henderson, Sr., conjures a mixture of emotions in each of our hearts. The first emotion we feel is one of sadness at our loss. For men like Mr. Henderson are of a rare and excellent mold, and they are deeply missed when they pass from our midst.

But mixed in with all the sadness and regret is another feeling—a feeling of the warmth and privilege of having known such a man. Each of our lives is richer because part of that precious gift—life—was spent in the company of Ernest Henderson. His vitality, enthusiasm, belief in himself and others, and his many-faceted interest in making this a more exciting world to live in rubbed off on all he encountered. For Ernest Henderson had so many plus qualities that he could not help spilling some of his surplus energy and enthusiasm over onto others.

His business success provides the most tangible example of this quality: 30 years ago with his partner and former college classmate from his Massachusetts Institute of Technology days, Robert L. Moore, he purchased one hotel, the Stonehaven, in Springfield. Today, that enterprise has expanded to a multimillion-dollar chain, and the phrase "Sheraton Hotel" is known the world over as symbol of a quality place to stay.

People bring to their business their own personality. Mr. Henderson was a quality man. He admired and recognized the superlative. It was no small coincidence that one of the very next hotels he and his partner Moore were to acquire was located in Boston and named the "Sheraton." Ernest Henderson knew Boston was a quality city, and it was only fitting to name his hotel after a man whose workmanship never fell below superior: the 19th-century English cabinetmaker Sheraton. The Sheraton hotel chain took more than a name from this man who would settle for nothing less than the very best. The Sheraton hotel chain also took a standard.

Business success is merely one of the more tangible ways of measuring excellence in a man. There were many other ways in which Ernest Henderson benefited society with his ability and enthusiasm. I am sure all of you realize how demanding the expansive interests of the Sheraton chain were, yet somehow Ernest Henderson found time to give of his ability and energy to community and civic needs. He served as president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, president of the World Affairs Council, as a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and was a founding member of the people-to-people program.

Through these civic activities, as well as in his personal life, Ernest Henderson by example spurred others to strive for his own standards. Each of us is a better person because he knew Ernest Henderson. It is the warm feeling which stems from that knowledge that should be the prevailing one today. It should be the feeling that is central in our minds and hearts, for our personal friendship with Ernest Henderson and the fulfillment that it brought with it, is what will offer us some compensation for our loss.

I also would like to call attention to a splendid editorial on the late Ernest

Henderson which appeared in the Boston Herald-Traveler on Friday, September 8, 1967, and for the information of the House I include herein the editorial:

ERNEST HENDERSON, SR.

Ernest Henderson Sr. was the kind of person a community likes to claim as a citizen. Besides being a remarkable success as a businessman, he cared deeply about what was happening in his city and took part (and provided leadership) in a broad range of civic activities. One of his prime concerns was education. He helped guide several institutions of higher learning in this area, and Northeastern University's center for adult education in Weston bears his name. But in addition, he was a colorful and interesting person. He had a sense of humor, and his interests and accomplishments were varied—photography, antique-collecting, ham radio, music (he composed as well as played, and once his work was performed by the Boston Symphony Orchestra). He even found time to write his autobiography.

As we say, this was the kind of fellow it's nice to have around. It would have been easy for Mr. Henderson to be "around" some other community than Boston. The Sheraton Corporation of America, which he headed, is the world's largest hotel chain, with 153 hostels in eight countries. But despite the international nature of his business, Mr. Henderson chose to remain in Boston, and to play an important role in what went on here, and our community is the richer for it. Mr. Henderson's funeral is at noon today, and all Boston can feel sorrow that he will be around no more.

RESTRICTIONS ON EXPORTS TO COUNTRIES DEALING WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, many of us are anxiously awaiting the publication of the testimony of Treasury Under Secretary Joseph W. Barr, Commerce Secretary Alexander B. Trowbridge, and Export-Import Bank President Harold F. Linder before the House Banking Committee on Tuesday.

Until such time as the full testimony is made public in print, I can only echo the sentiments of my friend and colleague from New York, PAUL FINO, who was aghast at the administration's placing more interest in dollars and cents than in American lives.

The Senate-passed restriction on exports to countries dealing with North Vietnam was one that would certainly meet with the approval of the overwhelming majority of the American people, and Representative FINO is to be commended for his challenging the administration spokesmen who are trying to sell this body of the Congress on a stand against such restrictions.

The life of one American serviceman is too dear a price to pay for this Nation's trading with our enemy and its allies. I cannot believe that there are businessmen in this country who would be selfish enough and so self-serving that they would put their balance sheets ahead of the lives of our troops who are slogging

through the jungles to keep the heavy boot of communism off the necks of our friends and our own United States.

I again commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], and join with him wholeheartedly in his effort to show the other side of the coin and to place the lives of our servicemen above the dollars and cents value that the administration apparently chooses to place on them. I cannot help but wonder how much of our effort in Vietnam is motivated by our stumbling economy, and how much is motivated by a sincere effort to see a free South Vietnam, in view of the administration's testimony yesterday.

RETIREMENT OF SAM DAVENPORT

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the House some 17 years ago, it was my good fortune to make the acquaintance of Sam Davenport. I quickly learned that when I needed fast, accurate information on the inner workings of Washington, I need only give Sam a call in the office of the House Coordinator of Information. He not only supplied the answers, but followed up to make sure I had encountered no problems.

We had another mutual interest and bond of friendship when his daughter and her family temporarily resided in my congressional district while his son-in-law was stationed at Ellsworth Air Force Base. Through them, Sam had an opportunity to learn firsthand of the beauties of the Black Hills of South Dakota.

It was with regret that I learned of Sam's retirement, but I hope it will afford him and his wife the opportunity to do many of the things they have postponed for years, beginning with a trip to Ireland. With him go the very best wishes of myself and my staff, along with his many friends on Capitol Hill.

INTERESTING SERIES ON BALTIC STATES

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the tragically forgotten peoples of the world are the long-suffering Baltic States, who were seized by the Soviet Union in 1940 in a manner so brazen that even our State Department has not officially recognized their seizure.

It was with great interest that I noted a series of articles in the Chicago Tribune by Frank Starr, chief of the Tribune's Moscow bureau, on his visit to

Latvia and Estonia. Even though one can read between the lines and sense the restrictions under which he operated and the propaganda that was fed, these articles make interesting reading, and I place them in the Record as a continuation of my remarks:

LITTLE ESTONIA DWARFS GIANT U.S.S.R. IN ITS URGE TO EXCEL

(By Frank Starr)

(NOTE.—Frank Starr, chief of the Tribune's Moscow Bureau, was invited to tour Latvia and Estonia, a rare treat for American correspondents living in the Soviet Union. This is the first of a series of stories which will appear daily on the two countries, which have been incorporated in the U.S.S.R.)

TALLINN, ESTONIA, September 2.—Among the people of the Soviet Union's 15 republics, Georgians are thought to be the loudest braggarts, but Estonians may have the most to brag about.

In their own way they let the visitor know that they lead the Soviet Union in a variety of areas from ski manufacture thru book publishing to church attendance.

RULED BY NEIGHBORS

With a quiet but proud dignity Estonians maintain a flair for living, an aloofness, a cultural level, ingenuity, and a native urge to excel not found elsewhere in the Soviet Union.

Since they appeared in the Baltic area eight centuries ago, these people of Finno-Ugric origin have been dominated by nearly all their neighbors at one time or another—Germans, Swedes, Danes, Poles, and Russians.

The German period brought the prosperity of the Hanseatic league and with it the construction of much of this city. The Swedish period was largely one of learning. After the arrival of the Russian Czar Peter the Great, Estonian peasants slowly gained legal and property rights.

The 20th century brought political upheaval, a short period of independence, then, after 1940, heavy industrialization and collectivization under Soviet rule.

LIKE ANOTHER COUNTRY

In the 23 years since Estonia was transformed into a soviet socialist republic its inhabitants have made their land one of the most admired of the 15.

Russians, when asked about their vacation in Tallinn, will answer, "It's such a cultured city, and so beautiful."

One said: "It's like going to another country. It's the only place in the Soviet Union where a sales clerk wraps my package before handing it to me and then says, 'Thank you.'"

Another described Estonia as "already western, you know."

FIFTY MILES FROM FINLAND

Indeed, Tallinn's connection with the west is strong. And its effects are obvious.

This city is only 50 miles across the Gulf of Finland from Helsinki. There are two boats daily, and Finns can and do visit Tallinn often for one day at a time without a visa.

Altho soviet officials say Estonians can also visit Finland and do "by the thousands," Estonians privately say that such a trip is nearly impossible.

A cab driver said he had been trying for two years to go to Helsinki and had recently given up the plan.

WESTERN DRESS, DANCING

But Helsinki comes to Tallinn. It can be seen on the streets and in the restaurants where stylishly-dressed couples dance perfect dancing-school tangoes and waltzes with grace and elegance.

Estonian youths know who Batman is and Danny Kaye and Perry Mason. They see American films on Finnish television which

they can receive with a special antenna usually available in electronic shops.

This visitor was startled to see while wandering thru the drab but clean passageways of Tallinn's old city "The Beatles," written in English with chalk on the side of a medieval house.

MORE FREEDOM APPARENT

Westerners in Moscow believe that the Soviet government allows latitude to the Baltic states that doesn't exist in other parts of the union.

There would be good reason for it. Visitors to other republics and even within the Russian federation usually hear a recitation comparing poverty and illiteracy statistics before the "great October socialist revolution in 1917" with conditions today.

But in Estonia by 1886 only 2 percent of the military recruits were unable to read, and two-fifths of the privately-owned land was held by peasants. Peasant sons had been eligible for study at Tartu university since its founding in 1632.

Altho it only accounts for one million of the Soviet Union's 220 million people, Estonia contributes much, including electric energy, instruments, machines, fuel and lubricating oils, textile fabrics, and live stock, to the development of other Soviet republics.

MANY OWN THEIR HOMES

It has been estimated that one-third of Tallinn's population of 300,000 lives in privately-owned homes. The city has thousands of attractive two-story brick houses with peaked roofs, neat yards, and attached garages.

Altho there are some privately-owned homes in Moscow, too, they are generally being replaced by vast developments of apartment blocks. Those that remain are usually of old Russian wooden style and are poorly kept up.

Thruout the Soviet Union thousands of churches have been closed, and some towns have no churches at all. In Tallinn there are about 20, and natives say that every one of them is functioning. More than half are Protestant.

RUSSIAN SECOND LANGUAGE

Russification of this republic appears to be slight. Russian is clearly the second language, and the Russian population accounts for about 19 percent which, according to soviet figures, is somewhat less than the percentage before the war.

Most signs are in both languages—Estonian first. The governmental bodies use Estonian, and the first deputy premier, Edgar Tonurist, apologized for the state of his Russian and expressed hope he would be understood.

In answer to a question about the Russian influence on Estonian national culture he said: "I cannot say that they lower the level of our cultural life. Hostility between nations occurs when there is no work and no bread. These conditions do not exist here, so you cannot say that there is any hostility between us."

It was a standard answer.

TRY HARD TO EXCEL

But certainly the urge to excel and the competitive spirit are tied to the ethnic identity that Estonians feel.

One youth noted with visible pride that in a recent basketball tournament in Moscow the Estonian team had beaten the Moscow team and had placed second after the Ukrainians.

"You know, even in sports money has a lot to do with success," he said. "They have 200 million people to choose from and we have one million, but we outplayed them."

There is also a desire to make life as comfortable as possible, and on that score, too, the success appears to be well above the soviet average. On the outskirts of Tallinn is an exhibition of economic and cultural

achievement marking the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution.

MANUFACTURERS HIGH GRADE

It is ironic because, shortly after the revolution, Estonia declared its independence, and it wasn't until 1940 that it became one of the soviet republics.

The exhibition is a good display of the quality of Estonian-manufactured consumer goods. Furniture, tho still lacking style, is superior to that available in Moscow shops.

Glassware and stainless steel table utensils approached Scandinavian products in design and quality. Handicrafts, including pottery and leatherwork also were far superior to the usual Russian fare.

Unfortunately, lamented one Estonian, there are almost 350,000 tourists a year, and they buy up such products as quickly as they hit the shelves. Only 25,000 of those tourists are non-Soviet, according to soviet figures.

LOWEST BIRTH RATE

Estonians count for themselves several first place achievements among the soviet achievements among the soviet republics—and one last place.

They are credited with the first place in book publishing per capita, the highest rate of housing construction, and the highest percentage of employment.

But they have the lowest birth rate—14.4 per 1,000.

ESTONIA SETS FARMING PACE—23 PERCENT OF LAND IS UNDER CULTIVATION

(By Frank Starr)

TALLINN, ESTONIA, September 3.—Early this month, the Kremlin published the admission that there are "major shortcomings" in the production and sale of meat and dairy products thruout the Soviet Union.

Production of many of these items, the statement said, "does not meet the requirements of the population." The quality and variety of some products were unsatisfactory, including such sophisticated items as dietetic products.

BLAME SOVIET BUREAU

The soviet ministry of the meat and dairy industry and local government and party organizations were blamed for not making full use of available funds for capital investment.

In March, 1965, a plenary meeting of the party central committee had authorized a considerable increase in state purchases of cattle and milk products. However, there was a gross disproportion between this new demand and the current supply.

SETS HIGHER GOALS

Thus the Kremlin set higher goals and ordered vast new construction and demanded retooling and improvement of existing facilities.

Further, for the period, 1968 to 1970, 1.66 billion dollars has been allocated for the development of the industry.

Yet Estonia, whose number one products are meat and milk, makes direct export deals for the sale of those items produced above the requirements of its state plan.

For example, meat and milk are exported to East Germany in exchange for agricultural machinery produced there.

Butter and cheese produced near Tallinn are exported to France, East and West Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and last year for the first time, to England. Lactose is also exported to India.

Estonia produces seed grain and pedigreed live stock for sale to other republics within the Soviet Union.

In short, Estonia appears to be the showcase of the Soviet Union's lagging agricultural establishment.

Twenty-three per cent of the republic's territory is under cultivation, and 23 per cent of the working population is engaged in

agriculture. In 1966, they accounted for 24 percent of the republic's over-all revenue. Three-quarters of this income came from the raising of live stock.

FORM STATE FARMS

Historically an area given primarily to agriculture, Estonia underwent heavy industrialization after it was absorbed into the Soviet Union in 1940.

Almost immediately afterward began the process of combining individual farms into large state and collective farms.

Collective farms are those operated autonomously by a board of managers and a chairman ostensibly responsible to the members of the farm.

The land belongs to the state and is granted to the farmer without rent. The farm has a single market for its produce—the state. However, individual farmers may sell at a farmers' market what they grow on their own small plots.

BELONG TO THE STATE

A state farm is operated like any state industrial enterprise with the land, the equipment, and the produce belonging to the state.

Estonians say their collective farmers produce higher yields and take home larger salaries than state farmers whose maximum pay will be \$111 a month. The specialists who work for such farms may make as much as \$166.50 monthly.

The Estonian Research Institute of Agriculture and Land Improvement at Saku, not far from here, is one of two such organizations in Estonia.

Its first concern is also one of the main problems of Estonian agriculture—improvement of the rocky, marshy land that covers much of the countryside.

PROFIT IS THREEFOLD

The institute has 8,648 acres of which 4,447 acres are considered arable. With this land, operated as a state farm, and the 1,800 cows and calves, the organization, according to its director, makes a profit which is three times the government's cost of operating the institute.

Although this farm is a little larger than the average state farm, both state and collective farms run much larger than an average farm in the United States midwest. Many small farms were combined during the period of collectivization.

The farm's milk herd produces 1,004 gallons of milk per cow per year which western agricultural experts say is "quite good—well above the national average."

DAIRY PROFIT IS 6.9 CENTS

Live stock and milk are the staples, and a considerable amount of grain and potatoes are raised for fodder. The farm's average yield of 7.7 tons of potatoes per acre has been surpassed considerably by some collective farms which say they get 9.7 tons.

Modern milking methods are becoming available altho they are presently in use for only 19 per cent of the republic's cows. However, milk handling facilities in the institute's cow barn would compare favorably with a well-equipped barn in Wisconsin.

Tallinn's only dairy takes in 240 tons of milk daily of which half is pasteurized and bottled for sale and half is used in the production of other dairy products.

The dairy pays collective farms 17.4 cents for a quart of milk, which it sells to Tallinn's stores for 24.3 cents. The stores sell milk for 27.5 cents.

Last year, the soviet government began trying a new system of full accountability on farms in an effort to realize higher profits.

This meant that losses, once underwritten by the state, now must be accounted for and absorbed by the farms themselves.

The plan was applied only to the most progressive farms—about 3 per cent thruout

the country. However, it is thought that all of the farms in Estonia are using the new system.

DIFFICULT TO RESOLVE

To westerners, however, soviet profit and loss figures are difficult to resolve, because the prices are not established according to costs and demand in a free market but by the state.

Thus by setting the prices for what it buys as well as for what it sells the state can determine whether a farm realizes a profit or a loss.

Further, farm managers often cannot decide what crops to raise on the basis of their relative profitability but must raise what the state determines its needs to be.

ESTONIA MAJOR U.S.S.R. POWER SOURCE—SUPPLIES MANY OTHER RUSS STATES

(By Frank Starr)

TALLINN, ESTONIA, September 4—High over the exit of the Kalinin mercury electrifier plant hangs a sign, in Russian, which reads, "Thank you, if you worked well!"

Under it every day pass 2,500 workers, many of them young women who make \$127.65 a month and work a five-day week of 41 hours.

They are part of a vast industrialization that has been going on in Estonia since it became part of the Soviet Union in 1940.

Today, according to soviet figures, industry accounts for 67 per cent of Estonia's national income.

SHORT OF RESOURCES

Altho, it is short of natural resources, Estonia's contribution to the soviet industrial economy includes machinery, excavators, precision instruments, electric equipment, textiles, building materials, electricity, and fuel.

The one raw material that exists in abundance here is oil shale, which is being rapidly mined and processed to produce oil, gas, and numerous by-products.

The exploitation of this resource has resulted in the construction of the Baltic Thermo-Electric Power station which was finished two years ago. Officials say it is the world's first such point working on oil shale.

In the year of its completion, Estonia met all of its own electric power demand and provided to other soviet republics 3 billion kilowatt hours of power.

FACTORY DATES TO 1870

The Kalinin plant is one of the oldest factories in Estonia, dating back to 1870. Originally a producer of railroad equipment, the plant was re-tooled 10 years ago to produce mercury electrifiers used in electric locomotives. It also makes other equipment including transformers.

One of the republic's showcase factories, it was one of those which went on the new economic reform [profit incentive] as of Jan. 1. The director reports that already production has increased more than 35 percent over last year.

The plant managers now are free to do some of their own production planning and to find their own domestic markets. The director said, however, that markets are no problem since the demand is far above the plant's production.

INCOME IS SUBSTANTIAL

In the first six months of this year, the director said, the plant realized a net income of 4.6 million rubles—600,000 over what the state plan demanded. The income would be \$5,106,000 at the official exchange rate of \$1.11 to the ruble.

Of the excess income, 50 per cent went to the state. Of the remainder, half—or 150,000 rubles—was used for plant improvement and half was used for workers' bonuses.

The girls working in the Kalinin plant, however, fared better than some.

A large dairy that produces all of Tallinn's milk products realized an excess income (over the 1.5-million-ruble plan) of 70,000 rubles. Of that figure, 70 per cent went to the state.

Of the remaining 21,000 rubles, 60 per cent went for plant improvement, and 40 per cent for workers' bonuses.

If the bonuses were divided evenly among each plant's workers without regard for salaries, the dairy workers would have received 8.40 rubles for six months, and the factory workers 60 rubles.

PRICE PLAN INTRODUCED

The state, however, has just introduced a new price plan that will considerably reduce the Kalinin factory's profit, the director said.

Many of the old socialist labor incentives still exist. Posted in a prominent place are the photographs of individual workers who have over-fulfilled their quotas.

Nearby is a bust of Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin for whom the factory is named, and behind glass is the lathe Kalinin used when he worked at this factory in 1902 and 1903.

FLAG, BONUS AWARDED

Kalinin, an organizer and active participant in the 1917 Bolshevik revolution, joined the revolutionary movement in 1898 and worked in the St. Petersburg Putilov steel works, which was the scene of heavy revolutionary activity.

Another incentive is a prize flag and 21,000 ruble bonus awarded a top factory every three months by Moscow. The Kalinin plant, the director said, has won both for a year and half.

Three quarters of Estonia's output in light industry is accounted for by textile manufacture. In this area the little republic ranks fourth among the Soviet Union's 15, but it ranks first in per capita output.

Using raw cotton produced in the southern republics—Uzbek, Turkmen, Tajik, Kirghiz, and Kazakh—Estonia's huge Kreenholm combine in Narva sends fabrics all over the Soviet Union and to Poland, Hungary, and Finland.

The Kreenholm works also dates back to the turn of the century, when it was one of the largest textile mills in Europe.

SILENT ON PROBLEMS

The problems faced by soviet enterprises are difficult to learn; most managers just won't admit that they have any, or they answer that they are struggling to construct communism.

However, the loss of manpower suffered in the Baltic states during and immediately after World War II emerges as the source of one of the problems.

Officially Estonia boasts about its high employment rate—94 per cent of eligible adults and working school children. Even women, as in other parts of the Soviet Union, can be seen swinging picks and shovels in construction projects, or driving heavy excavating equipment.

Particularly in the building industry is the shortage of manpower noticeable. The Estonian government is negotiating with Finland for the employment of Finnish workers to build three new hotels in Tallinn—one of which is to rise 22 stories.

HANDLE ENTIRE JOB

A government spokesman said the Finns would perform the entire job and be paid by the Estonian government. They would travel weekly by boat, spending their week-ends across the gulf in Finland.

The spokesman expressed confidence that the deal would be closed without difficulty.

Another sign of this shortage, according to city officials here, is the use of prefabricated wall sections in the construction of apartment and office buildings. The advantage is that they reduce the amount of manpower necessary.

One type of section, made without the use of cement and, therefore, relatively inexpensive, has been invented by an Estonian who won a Lenin prize for his work. The material is called silikatsit and is being sold in foreign countries including Japan and Italy.

RIGA CHURCH CROSSES BROKEN

(By Frank Starr)

RIGA, LATVIA, September 5.—In a prominent place opposite the Latvian government buildings on Lenin street—Riga's main thoroughfare—stands a Russian Orthodox cathedral.

Even from a distance its outline rises above the trees that shade benches and pathways and the meandering stream that offers a kind of rustic peace to tired pedestrians.

It is traditional in style with its five little towers, each one topped by an onion-shaped dome and the center one a bit larger and higher than the surrounding four.

But the Orthodox crosses that normally top each dome have been knocked off, leaving only a stub of a shaft; the arched entrance has been plugged with a pane of glass and a single swinging glass door; inside instead of high vaulted ceilings is a low false one hiding indirect lighting.

SOUND OF LAUGHTER

Under this ceiling is a carpeted room looking remarkably like an American movie lobby, and thru another door comes the sound of an audience in exuberant laughter.

The building is Riga's House of Knowledge—a hall for lectures, movies, and exhibits. Except for its traditional shape, it bears no evidence whatsoever of religious purpose.

Across town in the old section, where narrow cobblestone streets wind among centuries-old houses, stand two freshly painted buildings. They are the only ones in the neighborhood and among very few in the entire city that have new paint.

One is considered to have historical importance and therefore enjoys the protection of the government. The other is a small neighborhood church.

CHURCH IS PROUD

Because, as the officially atheist Russians put it, church and state are separate in the Soviet Union, the parish has the full responsibility to maintain its church, and some, like this one, are maintained with pride when funds are available.

But Riga is a collection of paradoxes and contradictions.

Along Lenin street and in the wandering park that crosses it perpendicularly are neat, well kept flower gardens and trimmed lawns. Thru its commercial section are numerous shops well stocked with attractive products.

Yet there are streets in the old section which, when deserted at dusk, as they often are, bear no sign of life at all—like a city uninhabited for decades.

What may once have been neat little corner cafes now look colorless and shabby, their dark windows staring blankly onto the abandoned street. There are no signs, no fresh paint, not plant life, no lights, no color.

Across a vacant lot on the blank wall one can just make out the faded but familiar bold block letters SHELL. A Russian newsman comments that the sign must have been painted there for the filming of a picture in Riga.

A bit further on is another sign showing thru the paint over it. It is a long arrow bearing the German words: Escape Route Along Canal. Dating from the World War II German occupation, it is another piece of Riga's turbulent past.

HANDICRAFTS ARE ATTRACTIVE

Latvian handicrafts made here are among the Soviet Union's most attractive, and their artists among the most popular.

Decorative textiles of wool and linen, scarves, shawls, table cloths, and bed spreads, are woven by women who work in the artists combine operated by the artists' union.

Using generally subdued colors and carefully following the principle of symmetry they make their own designs and weave their own cloth on looms owned by the union.

At this work, a combine leader said, they

make 80 to 100 rubles a month. [A ruble is \$1.11 at the official rate.]

Others there work with pottery, ceramics, glass mosaics, and leather. In addition there are sculptors and painters.

MUST SELL THROUGH COMBINE

An artist who creates his own work outside the combine but who is a member of the union will sell his work through the combine, which takes a 25 per cent commission.

The director said that artists may work outside the union and sell their works through commission shops, which also take their cut and sell everything from antique jewelry to used rugs.

The combine has five salons throughout Riga that serve as outlets for the work of its members. These are some of Riga's most attractive shops.

The V.E.F. factory, looking much like any factory in the world in the 1930s with a cluster of drab brick buildings surrounding a central yard, provides radios and telephones.

Its director, Alexander Egle, is a small wiry man of 62 who likes to tell his guests that in 1931 and 1932, "under the bourgeois regime," he was unemployed.

REPORTS PRODUCTION UP

He also tells how the factory he directs produces in five days what it took a year to produce "under the bourgeois regime," and how, before 1940, there was only one woman engineer and now there are hundreds. In fact, 60 per cent of the workers are women.

The factory is not only the place of work but the social center for thousands of people. It organizes its own recreation outings including camping, its own sports teams and events, its own social functions, and its own educational endeavors. Thus it occupies both working and leisure time.

ESTONIANS FISH, RAISE MINK—RED COLLECTIVE GAINS FROM INITIATIVE

(By Frank Starr)

TALLINN, ESTONIA, September 7.—An integral part of the fishing business—at least according to Oscar Kuul—is raising mink.

Kuul is the president of a fishing collective near Tallinn, and he knows the meaning of the word business.

But what has fishing for sprats got to do with mink? Well, he answered with refreshing enthusiasm, sprats cannot all be canned—some must be culled out, and mink thrive on fish meal.

And there, in a nutshell, is why Tallinn fishermen raise mink.

RUNS WHOLE OPERATION

The Tallinn collective, like many collectives, is largely self-sufficient and performs every operation from catching the fish through giving labels on the cans to finding a profitable place for the garbage.

But this one appears to benefit from considerably more initiative than many collectives.

Presently there are three buildings going up at once to enlarge the canning operation, and Kuul said the membership is increasing each year by 200.

It was here that one of the officials urged guests to hurry along, "because time is money." And it was here that one member built an assembly line machine because purchasing would have meant two machines and twice the cost.

BUILT OWN CAR

The same mechanic is the proud owner of a rather sporty low-slung automobile—a refreshing switch from the stiff and staid soviet machines. He built it himself in his spare time.

The fish, mostly sprats—a small European herring—and flounder, are smoked in the collective's own ovens and canned by women who must pack the sprats by hand.

This is necessary, it was explained, because fish packed together must be of uniform size,

and it would take an electronic device not available here to automate that function.

These women, Kuul said, make 150 to 160 rubles [\$166.50 to \$177.60] per month during the season and 50 rubles per month during the two months when there is no work.

OWNS 50 VESSELS

The collective owns 36 small trawlers used for Baltic fishing and 14 medium sized ones used for Atlantic fishing. Further, in its own small ship yard, it builds about one ship a year.

It repairs its own nets, builds its own houses, and furnishes them with its own furniture, Kuul said. Among the 1,300 members of the cooperative are 140 construction workers, an architect, and 40 furniture makers whose furniture is sold outside the collective when all the internal needs are met.

Canning facilities do not yet match the collective's fishing capacity. During the season about 50 per cent of the catch must be canned elsewhere, tho the director hopes that this situation will be remedied by 1970.

In order to reduce the idle season, fish are purchased in Latvia and elsewhere to wring the longest use of canning facilities.

AMONG BEST PAID

Fishermen, Kuul said, make as much as 2,700 rubles per year—or 225 per month. This would make them some of the best paid collective workers in the Soviet Union.

Kuul said the collective had a gross income of 3.8 million rubles last year and has planned for 4.2 million this year, altho he hopes to reach 5 million. Half the income above the plan is divided among the members.

The fur farm came into the picture in 1961, 11 years after the collective was formed. Such branching out, Estonians said, is not uncommon here.

OTHERS HAVE SIDELINES

A nearby farm which grows potatoes built a starch factory and now buys potatoes elsewhere to supplement its own supply. Some of these sidelines were established before capital improvement of the farm took place.

The fishermen began in 1961 with 400 animals, silver fox as well as mink. Today they have 5,500 animals, of which 3,800 are mink. They expect a total of 20,000 by 1970.

The mink have a life span of 8 to 10 months before being killed for fur in December and January. Last year the fur business yielded 182,000 rubles, Kuul said.

Mr. Speaker, we will not have lasting peace and true freedom in the world until the tragic results of World War II diplomacy are corrected and the people of the Baltic States and other captives of the Soviet Union are allowed to enjoy their right of self-determination.

"PROBLEMS IN PARADISE"

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, from October 1953 to November 1959, the American territories of American Samoa and Guam were imaginatively and progressively governed by a distinguished South Dakotan, Richard Barrett Lowe.

Each of these South Pacific possessions was a matter of great concern to Washington at the time prior to his appointments. Both were facing innum-

erable problems internally and in their relationships with the United States.

The man sent to deal with these difficulties was well suited to this challenge. He possessed an outstanding record of production and creativity and a varied background uniquely complimentary to the scope of his job.

Governor Lowe was born and reared in South Dakota and was accustomed to hard work at an early age. He became a teacher of American history and government with such a talent for administration that within a short time he had been president of two South Dakota colleges and dean of a college in Nebraska.

Joining the Navy during World War II, he gained the rank of lieutenant commander and was military government officer on an island in the South Pacific. After the war he was able to revise the entire recruiting approach of our armed services, an innovation which brought his talents to the attention of Washington and eventually led to his governorship appointments.

His experiences in American Samoa and Guam are now recounted in a book, "Problems in Paradise," that is part travel guide, part history, part government organizational manual, part sociology, part sheer amusement, and all fascinating.

This book contains a little of everything about these islands as seen in "the view from Government House."

The Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, gives full credit to Governor Lowe's contributions in the foreword to "Problems in Paradise" which I insert in the Record.

FOREWORD

(By Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL)

In government, understanding without action is valueless. Advancement is inevitably precluded until the appearance on the scene of a responsible, able, industrious and dedicated public servant. Such a man is Richard Barrett Lowe, Governor of American Samoa from October 1, 1953 to October 14, 1956, and Governor of Guam from October 15, 1956 to November 14, 1959.

Before the arrival of Governor Lowe, the people of American Samoa had been through the unsettling experience of having four appointed civilian governors and four acting governors within a period of 24 months. As a Congressman, I was concerned about the effect of such executive instability upon the economic, social and political progress of the islands. My first personal association with Barry Lowe and his charming and helpful wife, Emmy Lou, took place in November 1954 when I arrived in American Samoa with a small group representing the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Governor Lowe had been in office nearly 14 months when our group arrived in Pago Pago. The greeting by him, his wife and staff was most friendly and sincere. The official leaders of the Samoan people thoroughly enjoyed their part in the welcoming ceremonies. Nothing was left to be desired by a first-time visitor like myself. It was a splendid introduction to the beautiful islands of American Samoa and their loyal and hospitable people.

Our visit lasted five days. During that time nearly every wakeful hour was filled with work. From the beginning I became aware of the ability, the industry, the dedication and the goals of Governor Lowe. A new day had dawned in American Samoa, and the wonderful thing about it was that

the Samoan people themselves realized it. The long and arduous task of bringing these island Americans into closer union with the rest of us, of building a more stable economy and of moving toward more self-government had started. Governor Lowe and his supporters had recognized the needs of the people and were laying the sound foundations to meet them. While it was true that the work was slow and tedious (due in a great measure to the unresponsive attitude of the Congress and of the National Administration), nevertheless the forward movement had at last begun and, in my opinion, was brought about largely by the efforts of Governor Lowe.

In his inaugural address Governor Lowe stated that his administration would relinquish appropriate authority to capable Samoans as rapidly as they were ready to assume responsibilities. Accordingly, several noteworthy achievements took place during his tenure. The legislature and executive structure of the territory was restyled and stabilized. Early in 1954 he issued an executive order establishing a Constitutional Committee "to bring many of the benefits of organic legislation and at the same time permit the people of Samoa to maintain their territorial system of land tenure and social organization so long as they meet Samoan needs." This committee took the first steps to draft the existing Constitution of American Samoa.

Among other things the defunct tuna packing plant located in Pago Pago Harbor was leased to the Van Camp Seafood Company by Governor Lowe in 1953, and has been operating profitably and employing hundreds of Samoans during the past 14 years. The rebuilding of the abandoned and inadequate military airport at Tafuna, which now accommodates transoceanic jet liners, was authorized and initiated in Lowe's administration.

It was my duty and pleasure to follow closely the activities of Governor Lowe during his term of office in American Samoa and later in Guam, where he continued his efforts to lead the people toward economic, political and social improvement. He was a man who never dodged an important issue. His dedication, his industry, his ability and desire to serve his country and the people of his immediate responsibility remained with him throughout his public career. His was a job well done. Both in Samoa and Guam, Governor Lowe's work had been so distinguished that for the first time native sons were appointed as his successors upon his recommendation.

The readers of this book will enjoy, as I have, the many interesting and humorous stories contained herein. More important, however, they will find many valuable and worthwhile lessons in history and government set forth clearly for their easy reading and enjoyment.

REACHING THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the Republican task force on agriculture has finally reached the administration's conscience. It is obvious by Mr. ALBERT's comments of August 31, 1967, that he is defending the current conditions for which the administration officials are taking great pride.

I have two items of interest to the Members of the U.S. Congress. They are some of the agriculture cash prices as listed on Monday, September 11, 1967, in the Wall Street Journal, and an editorial from the Grant County Herald, Elbow Lake, Minn.:

CASH PRICES

	Mon.	Yr. Ago
FOODS		
Flour, hard winter NY cwt.....	\$6.75	\$7.67
Butter, Fresh A-92 sc NY lb.....	.67½	.74½
Eggs, Lge-mix Ext, Chgo, doz.....	.31½	.48½
Broilers, 3 lb & under DelMV lb.....	.10½	.16½
Hogs, Chicago top cwt.....	20.50	24.75

GRAINS AND FEEDS

Wheat, No. 2 ord hard K Cbu.....	1.52	1.95
Corn, No. 2 yel Chicago bu.....	1.20½	1.44
Oats, No. 1 wh. heavy, Chgo, bu.....	.74	.75
Rye, No. 2 Minneapolis bu.....	1.17½	1.26
Barley, Malting NY bu.....	1.70	1.76
Soybeans, No. 1 yel Chicago bu.....	2.70½	3.16
Bran, Buffalo ton.....	38.00	50.00
Linseed Meal, Minneapolis ton.....	73.50	82.00
Cottonseed Meal, Memphis ton.....	80.00	87.00
Soybean Meal, Decatur, Ill. ton.....	77.50	86.50

FATS AND OILS

Cottonseed Oil, crd. Miss Vly lb.....	.117½	.151½
Corn Oil, crude Chicago lb.....	.12½	.14½
Soybean Oil, crd Decatur, Ill. lb.....	.0933	.1219
Peanut Oil, crd Southeast lb.....	.12	.14½
Lard, Chicagoable.....	.0725	.1212
Tallow, bleachable, NY lb.....	.05½	.07½
Linseed Oil, raw NY lb.....	.1358	.1358

TEXTILES AND FIBERS

Print Cloth, 64 x 6038½ in. NY yd.....	.131½	.16
Print Cloth, 80 x 8039 in. NY yd.....	.19½	.21
Sheetings, 56 x 60 40 in. NY yd.....	.21	.22½
Burlap, 10 oz. 40 in. NY yd.....	.1365	.1470
Wool, fine staple terr. Bstn, lb.....	1.21	1.37
Wool Tops, NY lb.....	1.595	1.730
Rayon, Satin Acetate NY yd.....	.23	.24½

MISCELLANEOUS

Hides, light native cows Chgo lb....	.14	.19½
--------------------------------------	-----	------

Mr. Speaker, certainly the items listed on the above price list show that the price-cost structure in agricultural commodities at the present time is not even as good as the poor conditions of 1 year ago. Let me name just a few. Wheat is down 43 cents, corn 24 cents, and soybeans off 46 cents. The farmers of this country are reacting to these conditions, and the recent meeting of 35,000 farmers at the National Farmers Organization convention in Des Moines, Iowa, is just the beginning of a massive movement to get the administration to listen and act on programs that will improve this bleak price-cost outlook. I only wish that those that paint such a rosy picture of the agriculture scene in this country would visit with the farmers who are receiving the parity ratio of 75 for their goods. I spoke with those people, and I am convinced that the present administration, through poor management of Government programs, has not been on the side of the American farmer. This poor management shows farm income down \$2.5 billion from 1 year ago, while the wage earners' national income has risen \$36.1 billion. No wonder the editorial below expresses the concern felt by the people I spoke with over this last Labor Day recess:

WE WELCOME CONCERN

Agricultural Secretary Orville Freeman, in a recent statement before Utah farm leaders, requested farmers to market their record-breaking crops cautiously this fall in order to avoid a possible sharp price drop during the harvest season.

The Secretary was quoted as saying that careful marketing could help feed grain and soybean producers sidestep the problems encountered this year by wheat growers, who the Secretary said loaded the marketing channels at harvest, resulting in temporary gluts that pushed prices down.

We are certainly glad the Secretary has expressed some concern about the depressed farm commodity markets. And we're glad he recognizes that a temporary glut forces prices down. But it must depend on whose farm commodity sales are glutting the market. It seems unique that the Secretary should acknowledge such a fact of life at this time, when only a short time ago he denied the Agriculture department's CCC dumping of grains on the market had any effect at all.

American farmers should be able to recall all too clearly the times when the department announced huge dumpings of CCC stocks on the market, with the resulting drop in farmer prices. But the department emphatically denied such glutting was responsible. At least it is now recognized by all that any temporary dumping of a commodity on the market has the effect of reducing price.

Farmers have every right to be indignant over the shoddy treatment they have received from the department and Administration policy-makers. In order to give our agricultural producers a square deal, they must be assured that their productive efforts will be equitably rewarded and that there will be no repetition of the many anti-farm price maneuvers of the executive branch of the Federal government.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the American farmer is concerned, it is not a matter of restoring the "G" in GOP as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] has suggested, but rather putting a "D" back into Democrat when it comes to offering the farmer a square deal.

TO FARM OR GO FISHING?

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, anyone who looks at the farm statistics these days knows that many of our farmers are leaving the land. In almost all cases, it is not by choice, but due to the fact that the farmer still lags far behind the rest of the population in income. This year, his income is dropping while his expenses keep rising. It is small wonder that we in the Midwest see increasing numbers of auction sale notices.

Mr. Roy Larson, of Wolverton, Minn., recently sent me a clipping from the Forum, the daily newspaper from Fargo, N. Dak., that vividly portrays the problems of the farmer. I call particular attention to the opening sentence of this sale bill, which shows an ironic sense of humor, tragic as the case may be.

The sale bill from the Forum is included at this point in the Record:

AUCTION SALE

5 miles north on Highway 75 and 80 rods west of Kent, or 4½ miles south of Wolverton on Highway 75 and 80 rods west. Having farmed for more darn years than I care to mention and upon the advice of our honorable Mr. Freeman, I've decided to say the heck with it and go fishing.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12—1 P.M.

1—1966 Case 931 Comfort King with 3 point hitch, less than 500 hours; 1—1960 Cockshutt 550 gas with 4 row cultivator only 1700 hours; 1—1959 Cockshutt 428 combine with pickup chopper, loose bar and Hume reel; 1—15 foot pull type Cockshutt swather; 1—14 foot pull type Moline swather; 1—14 foot John Deere press drill with fertilizer and grass attachments; 1—12 foot Oliver low wheel drill; 1—13'4" Kewanee wheel carrier tandem disc; 1—14 foot International chisel plow; 1—14 foot International field cultivator; 1—12 foot International field cultivator; 2—7 section drags with transports; 1—4 section John Deere rotary hoe; 1—4x16" Massey Harris plow; 1—3x14" Case plow; 1—7 foot Cockshutt mounted mower; 1—Pollard wheel rake; 1—Johnson hydraulic loader, manure fork; 1—8 foot snow bucket; 1—28 foot auger elevator with engine; 1—1950 L-160 International 2 ton grain truck, hydraulic hoist, just completely overhauled. Terms: Cash unless arrangements are made with clerk before bidding.

Edwin Beaudin, owner. James Smykowski, auctioneer. Farmers and Merchants State Bank, Breckenridge, Minn., Clerk.

LEGAL INFORMATION FOR THE CONGRESS

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the need for better information handling by the Congress is obvious. The problem we have today is not that we lack sufficient information, but rather the lack of sufficient organization of that information in concise, coherent, and usable forms.

The Legislative Reference Service has a dedicated and exceptionally qualified expert in the area of information handling.

Recently he made a speech entitled "Legal Information for the Congress" at a conference on computers and taxes, sponsored by the National Law Center of George Washington University, in cooperation with the American and Federal Bar Associations of Washington, D.C.

His presentation is excellent and contains information that should be read by all Members of Congress:

LEGAL INFORMATION FOR THE CONGRESS, RAMIFICATIONS OF UTILIZING AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING

(A presentation before the Conference on Computers and Taxes, sponsored by the National Law Center of George Washington University in cooperation with the American and Federal Bar Associations, Washington, D.C., by Robert L. Chartrand, information sciences specialist, Science Policy Research Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.)

(NOTE.—The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Legislative Reference Service nor the Library of Congress.)

PREFACE

Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, ladies and gentlemen of the second annual conference on computers and taxes:

It may be said that the United States Congress has a certain identifiable involvement

in the taxation process, including the authorization of projected programs and operations, and the appropriation of tax monies to best serve the needs of the Nation. The basis for deciding how, when, and to what extent these programs are to be supported resides in the information provided the Congress by the Executive Branch departments and agencies.

Today, there often is the problem of *too much*, as opposed to *too little*, information which the Members and committees of the Congress must read, review, and relate to the requests placed before them. In no sector of the American society has the "information explosion" been felt more keenly than in the Federal Congress. The information needs of this elective body are as kaleidoscopic, numerous, and ever-changing as the constituencies which the Members represent. Among those information needs are ones involving various types of legal facts and interpretive information.

Within the past 25 years our civilization has been witness not only to the proliferation of written material, but to the development of automatic data processing (ADP) which has been put to use in many fields. During the past decade, a number of developmental projects has been initiated by government, foundation, university, and industrial groups interested in improving legal information handling. The needs of legal scholars, legislators, and practitioners have been identified. Major emphasis has been placed upon evolving techniques and procedures for aiding in legal research, law office management, and various aspects of the law practice.

During the course of this presentation, we shall consider the ways in which automatic data processing can help the Congressman as he seeks various forms of legal advice, analyses, and supporting information. A marked awareness has come into being on the part of many Members of the Congress that they must avail themselves of every possible tool and technique related to the indexing, abstracting, storage, correlation, and retrieval of priority information. As the legislators strive to orient and educate themselves in this unfamiliar milieu, they must do so in the light of the needs and opinions of those whom they represent. The rightness, legality, and utility of their decisions must stand the test of time and events yet to transpire.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary Congressmen are hard pressed to be aware of the pro's and con's of the major issues demanding their scrutiny and judgment. Dr. Ernest S. Griffith has pointed out that "in a given session of Congress there are forty or fifty issues . . . which are a reflection of a specialized, but interlocked technical age."¹ Another factor affecting the Congress is that our population is growing daily in size, complexity, and mobility; an estimated 12 million persons moved in the past two years. These conditions pose unprecedented problems for the conscientious Member.

Not only must the Member of Congress handle as many as hundreds of visitors and telephone calls each week, but he must respond also to the written opinions and demands of his constituents. Senator Thomas Kuchel reports that "between 1,000 and 2,000 letters reach my office each day";² and he represents a state comprised of almost 19 million people.

And so the sheer volume of on-going tasks places the Congressman and his staff in an

¹ Griffith, Ernest S. Congress, its contemporary role. New York, New York University Press, 1961, p. 72.

² Reform of Congress: David B. Truman (ed.), the Congress and America's future—a discussion, *In* Political science quarterly, v. LXXX, n. 4, December 1965, p. 611 [Review by Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.]

almost untenable position. How can they cater to the letters, calls, and visits of the voters and still manage to become knowledgeable about the multitudinous major and minor issues which require decisions? Thus far, the Members of the 90th Congress have introduced more than 13,000 public and private bills and resolutions.³ What aids are available, and should be utilized, to assist the individual Member and his supporters (whether personal staff or committee) to learn enough about these pieces of legislation to formulate alternative courses of action?

The challenge of devising new ways of performing traditional tasks, especially when existing procedures and work patterns no longer suffice, often is being met today on an interdisciplinary basis. Legislators, scientists, and information specialists are teamed to create new concepts and implementing mechanisms for coping with increasingly untenable working environments.

CONGRESS NEEDS LEGAL INFORMATION

Legal information, to serve the needs of the Congress, should possess the qualities of completeness, accuracy, timeliness, and relevance. The requester may prefer, or require, information in the form of digests, citations, indices, advisory opinions, analyses, surveys (e.g., state laws or Supreme Court decisions), or the full text of selected documentation. Some inquiries may be fulfilled by a telephone consultation while others may necessitate prolonged, interpretive research by a legal specialist.

The broad range of Congressional demands for legal research, opinions, and supporting information collection and compilation is reflected in the types of general studies prepared at the request of the Congress by the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service (LRS) in the Library of Congress. Recent studies⁴ have included:

"Equal Employment Opportunity: Legislative History and Analysis of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

"Initiative and Referendum with Particular Reference to Apportionment of State Legislatures."

"The Mallory Rule: Including State Court Decisions."

"Compilation of Court Decisions on Religious Instruction in the Public Schools."

"The Power of Congress to Prohibit Racial Discrimination in the Rental, Sale, Use and Occupancy of Private Housing."

"The Federal Lobbying Act."

The potential for computerized information retrieval was tested by the Legislative Reference Service in an instance when a Congressional request involved a search of the United States Code for all mention of the "death penalty." Concurrently with a search by LRS legislative analysts, the University of Pittsburgh was asked to conduct a machine search of the full text of the U.S. Code. The two search results included a heavy majority of the same citations, but each search effort did retrieve certain unique citations.⁵

The availability of legal-type information in readily accessible form in many cases places serious limitations on sufficiently rapid recall to answer the needs of the Congressman. With the advent of the electronic computer, a new dimension to legal research has been projected. Experimental projects undertaken by a number of groups in the private sector, or by government agencies working with outside consultants, have indicated a

³ Reflected in the latest issues of the Congressional record and the Digest of public general bills and resolutions.

⁴ Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, LRS multilithed reports, cumulated issue with index for numbers 1-14, September 1965-December 1966, p. 1-3.

⁵ Information provided by Lester S. Jayson, Director, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

promise of information handling techniques and computer programs which might benefit the Congress.

For the past several years the possibilities inherent in utilizing ADP have been explored by highly motivated individuals and groups, with the encouragement of special committees on computer applications formed by such legal professional organizations as the American Bar Association, Federal Bar Association, Association of American Law Schools, and the Association of American Law Libraries.⁶

Much attention was given by the various Associations' committees and the other innovators to the categories of legal data which might be susceptible to treatment through ADP technology:⁷

- *1. statutes.
- *2. court decisions.
- *3. administrative decisions.
- *4. administrative decisions and orders.
5. title records.
6. mortgages, liens, and similar recorded instruments.
- *7. cases and judgments in courts of record.
- *8. patents.
- *9. trademarks.
- *10. legislative history.
- *11. legal periodicals and other literature.
- *12. files, records, and evidence in significant cases.

(The asterisked * items would be of probable value to the Congress.)

The needs of the United States Congress for legal information are highly diverse, quite often unpredictable, and cover the gamut from broad philosophical commentaries to exonerating minutiae.

LEGAL INFORMATION RESOURCES FOR THE CONGRESS

Traditionally, the Congress has had several established sources of legal advice and information. Most Senators have designated Legislative Assistants, and many House staff personnel serve in a similar capacity. The American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service is called upon to handle a heavy volume of Congressional requests; in 1966, more than 12,000 inquiries were received from Members, committees, and (through Members' offices) constituents.⁸ Executive Branch agencies and departments offer substantial support to the Congress. In addition, the Congressmen have called upon law school faculty members, foundations, not-for-profit institutions, and lobbyist organizations for legal-type support.

The ability of any single resource group to respond to a Congressional request for support often is a sum of many factors. Is the key resource person available? In what form and where is the desired information? Will conventional research techniques extract the requisite data within an acceptable time frame? Are there over-riding considerations of non-technical nature which preclude the resource group usually called upon from responding?

CONSIDERATIONS OF USING AN ADP SYSTEM

There has been much debate within professional organizations and in leading journals regarding the necessity for full-text storage vis-a-vis some form of index-abstract. Although the legal community generally has accepted the full text approach for statutory information, several other developmental

projects have featured the "Sematic Coded Abstract" (Western Reserve University),⁹ the "Points in Law" approach of Oklahoma State University,¹⁰ the "root file" approach of the Southwestern Legal Foundation,¹¹ "Key Words in Combination" (University of Pittsburgh),¹² Maron and Kuhns' proposed "probabilistic indexing,"¹³ and the synonym Dictionary Generator (SYNDIG) Thesaurus developed by Irving Kayton at George Washington University.¹⁴

Thus, many approaches have been taken toward solving the spectrum of problems connected with converting, indexing, abstracting, storing, manipulating, and retrieving legal information. New applications of ADP to legal information handling are under development today. Yet with all of this activity and progress, the busy Congressman does not need to be an expert to use an ADP-oriented system. He will have to attempt to define his requirements, since:

The basic requirement for successful computer searching is knowledge of the legal issues involved in the problem to be searched—the same type of knowledge which is needed for statutory research using traditional methods. Knowledge of computing is no more necessary for computer searching than is knowledge of printing for reading a book.¹⁵

The question often asked, and rightfully so is: Can an ADP-centered information handling system provide better legal information to the Congress than existing capabilities? The answer is not apparent at this point in time, but several salient considerations regarding the possible utilization of automatic data processing in this role need to be noted: identification of the basic problems involving cost effectiveness and selection of system parameters; definition of those specific (priority) areas where the computer can help the legislator and his legal advisors; selection of the bodies of information *per se* to be considered for ADP storage and manipulation; and determination of alternative technical approaches for handling legal information by using machine programs and man-machine techniques.

The justification for creating and maintaining a legal information handling system, involving an electronic computer, for support of the Congress should be tied closely to the considerations noted above. The utility of such a system:

... must be measured by drawing a balance between the cost and effort that the user must expend and the completeness and correctness of the information that he gets as well as the convenience and speed with which he gets it. Thus, the usefulness of a retrieval system is determined not only by the speed at which it can treat a large volume of material but on the efficiency of organization of the material, and the form of the intended output.¹⁶

⁹ Loevinger, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹¹ Jurimetrics: the electronic digital computer and its application in legal research. In Iowa law review, v. 50, summer 1965, p. 1130.

¹² Harty, John F. The "Key Words in Combination" approach. In M.U.L.L., March 1962, p. 54-55.

¹³ Loevinger, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

¹⁴ Kayton, Irving. Retrieving case law by computer: fact, fiction, and future. In George Washington law review, v. 35, n. 1, October 1966, p. 31-42.

¹⁵ Sample computer search on Pennsylvania statutes. Health Law Center-School of Law. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh, 1963, p. 11.

¹⁶ Bushor, William E. Information storage/retrieval. In Electronics, 1962, p. 49. [Quoting G. L. Ordway.]

EXISTING REPOSITORIES OF LEGAL INFORMATION IN ADP FORM

The amount of legal literature available to the would-be researcher currently is estimated at 2½ million case reports and 1½ million statutory sections. The estimated rate of growth: 25,000 new opinions published annually, along with 29,000 statutes.¹⁷ Lawyers everywhere are concerning themselves with the problems of indexing, storing, and retrieving pertinent information.

Establishment and maintenance of machine-readable legal information repositories commenced about ten years ago. Significant pioneer work was commenced in 1957 in the area of health law statutes at the University of Pittsburgh under the leadership of Professor John Harty. Selecting the full-text approach, combined with a "Key Words in Combination" handling of vocabulary holdings, the computer was programmed "to find and report all documents containing a certain word, or, preferably, certain words appearing in specified combinations." Today, the magnetic tape holdings of the University of Pittsburgh Health Law Center include the complete codes of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey; the United States Supreme Court decisions since 1950; the health statutes of ten states; the Internal Revenue Code and Regulations; and other ordinances, court rules and reports, and legislative information.¹⁸ This information is available, upon request and with modest charges, to outside groups such as the Congress.

Another major source of legal information for the Congress is Project LITE (Legal Information Through Electronics), under the direction of the Air Force Accounting and Finance Center in Denver, Colorado. This System features a "keyword-in-context" (KWIC) access to full text information such as: the complete United States Code (updated to the 1965 supplement); the Comptroller General's Decisions complete to the last published volume, and also the unpublished decisions from 1955 to the present; the Armed Services Procurement Regulations; international agreements of interests to the Department of Defense (DOD); ten volumes of courts-martial reports; and other assorted DOD administrative materials such as Air Force Manuals, etc.¹⁹

Several Executive Branch agencies and departments also are developing limited holdings of machine-readable information which may be accessioned by other users. The Federal Aviation Agency (FAA), for example, has decisions of the FAA from 1958 to the present, indexed in depth, and computer maintained.²⁰ Quarterly publications reflecting holdings are scheduled for publication. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is involved in the computerization of FCC Reports commencing with the second series. The system also will include FCC late reports. All reports will be indexed in depth and the index, maintained through the use of computer programming, will be published by the Government Printing Office.²¹

A major project is the effort called "Re-

¹⁷ Wilson, Robert A. Computer retrieval of case law. In Southwestern law journal, v. 16, n. 3, September 1962, p. 409. [Quoting Vincent Flordalisi.]

¹⁸ Digital computers needs, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

¹⁹ Law school research projects reported. In M.U.L.L., September 1965, p. 122.

²⁰ Status information provided by Grant Reynolds, Office of the Air Force General Counsel, June 1967.

²¹ Status information provided by John C. Lyons, Co-Director, National Law Center, George Washington University, and Burton Lamkin, Librarian, Federal Aviation Administration, June 1967.

²² Status information provided by Hilbert Slosberg, Associate General Counsel, Federal Communications Commission, June 1967.

⁶ National Academy of Science-National Research Council. Digital computer needs in universities and colleges. Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences, 1966, p. 100.

⁷ Loevinger, Lee. Jurimetrics: the methodology of legal inquiry. In Jurimetrics. New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1963, p. 9-10.

⁸ Statistics provided by Basil T. Owens, Administrative Officer, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

ports and Information Retrieval Activity" (RIRA) sponsored by the Office of the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Department of the Treasury. This project²³ features the use of ADP in handling basic data on pending tax cases. Information provided includes the name of the case document, stage of case awaiting to be tried, classification of the case (e.g., prime versus standard), etc. The information, placed in a publication called *Issue Sequence*, has been indexed using an eight-digit number. Access to this material is not unlimited, due to invasion of privacy considerations; an American Bar Association request for access now is under consideration.

Useful information of a legal nature, such as statutory and legislative material, has been converted to ADP form by several states. In New York, for example, state Senate committee chairmen are provided each week with a computer-initiated list of all bills pending before their committees.²⁴ In Wisconsin, a statutory retrieval system is being developed for the state by Data Retrieval Corporation of America; in this instance, the entire text of the Wisconsin statutes comprises the data base, and may be accessed by free-form requests.²⁵

CONGRESS SEEKS AN ADP SUPPORT FACILITY

Members of the 90th Congress have taken steps to provide themselves with an automatic data processing support capability through direct action. More than a dozen bills²⁶ have been introduced (H.R. 21, et al.) by a bi-partisan group of House Members, calling for the establishment of an ADP facility located in the Legislative Reference Service. Representative Robert McClory of Illinois has cited the problem facing him and his colleagues:

The tools and techniques which have been developed in connection with the evolution of the electronic computer have much to offer the burdened decision-maker. The growing dilemma of the Congressman and his staff centers about the voluminous written information—reports, books, periodicals, specifications, memoranda—that must be screened, reduced to a useable length, filed, and later used as a reference.²⁷

Contained in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, passed by the Senate as S. 355, is a provision introduced by Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania²⁸ which embodies the essence of the McClory bill. This Senate bill now is being considered by the House Committee on Rules. Featured as one of the priority application areas to be developed in conjunction with the operation of such a Congressional facility is the storage, retrieval, and dissemination of legal information. This is reflected in a study prepared at

Congressional direction entitled "Automatic Data Processing for the Congress."²⁹

SUMMARY

In response to the question as to why a computer should be considered for use in handling legal information, three significant reasons have emerged:

1. The time of the lawyer spent in routine, methodical research may be reduced;
2. Selected areas of meticulously indexed legal material can be machine-searched; and
3. Attention of the lawyer may be focused upon only those areas which remain unsearched.

Essentially, the time of the legislator, his advisory staff, and legal research elements, is precious. If machine-stored information, thoroughly indexed, can be searched through the use of the computer, the human is freed for more demanding and judgmental tasks.

As the Congress strives to cope with the problems of the 1960 decade, its Members must know the legal ramifications of much of the legislation which is being considered. Our national security and standard of living are dependent upon the scope, ingenuity, and constitutionality of the scientific and social programs undertaken by the Federal, State, and local governments. To this end, the lawmakers must utilize the full resources, both human and technological, which can make possible the fulfillment of our Nation's goals.

FORGET THE GADGETRY IN VISIONS OF YEAR 2000

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the need to look to the future has been recognized by the American Academy of the Arts and Sciences. This group has formed a Commission on the Year 2000.

Dr. Daniel Bell, professor of sociology at Columbia University, is chairman of the commission. Last Sunday an article appeared in the Washington Post which was an excerpt of an article written by Dr. Bell regarding the work of this commission.

The article follows:

FORGET THE GADGETRY IN VISION OF YEAR 2000

(By Daniel Bell)

(NOTE.—The 1,000-page summer issue of *Daedalus*, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, is devoted to a first report on the labors of the Academy's Commission on the Year 2000. The preface stresses that the magazine's contents are "intended to be exploratory and tentative . . . the reader is not being offered a finished document. Rather, he is being invited to participate in an ongoing discussion, largely speculative, about which the commission would never think to speak with a single voice."

(Created in 1964, the Commission on the Year 2000 is made up of biologists, psychiatrists, economists, political scientists, Government people and scientists. It has held two plenary sessions, its members have written many papers, some of which are re-

printed in *Daedalus*, and eight "working parties" are considering several problems in detail.

(The accompanying article is excerpted with permission from the introduction to this issue of *Daedalus*. Entitled, "The Year 2000—Trajectory of an Idea," it is by Daniel Bell, chairman of the Commission, professor of sociology at Columbia University and author of "The Reforming of General Education" and other books.)

Time, said St. Augustine, is a threefold present: the present as we experience it, the past as a present memory and the future as a present expectation. By that criterion, the world of the year 2000 has already arrived, for in the decisions we make now, in the way we design our environment and thus sketch the lines of constraints, the future is committed.

Just as the gridiron pattern of city streets in the 19th century shaped the linear growth of cities in the 20th, so the new networks of radial highways, the location of new towns, the reordering of graduate school curricula, the decision to create or not to create a computer utility as a single system will frame the tectonics of the 21st century.

This is the premise of the Commission on the Year 2000. It is an effort to indicate now the future consequences of present public policy decisions, to anticipate future problems and to begin the design of alternative solutions so that our society has more options and can make a moral choice rather than be constrained, as is so often the case when problems descend upon us unnoticed and demand an immediate response.

But what began a few years ago as a serious academic enterprise has been seized, predictably, by the mass media and the popular imagination. The Columbia Broadcasting System has revamped its documentary program, "The 20th Century," into "The 21st Century," to depict the marvels of the future. Time has published a compact essay on "The Futurists: Looking Toward A.D. 2000." The theme of the year 2000 now appears repeatedly on lecture circuits and in the feature pages of newspapers.

A MAGIC NUMBER

All of this was probably to be expected. Much of the attention given the year 2000 is due clearly to the magic of the millennial number.

Men have always been attracted by the mystical lure of the *chiloi*, the Greek word for 1000 from which we get our religious term *chiliasm*, the belief in a coming life free from the imperfections of human existence. The early Christian expectation of a *parousia* (phosphered in Revelations 20) placed its hopes for a Second Coming at the end of a 1000-year period.

The millennial point is only 33 years away and within the lifetime expectation of more than three fourths of all Americans now alive.

A good deal of today's interest in the future arises also from the bewitchment of technology and the way it has transformed the world, and most of the images of the future have concentrated on dazzling technological prospects. The year 2000 has all the ingredients for becoming, if it has not already become, a Hula Hoop craze.

All of this has its good side and its bad. What is bad, to begin with, is that a serious and necessary effort is in danger of being turned into a fad, and any fad trivializes a subject and quickly wears it out. A second evil is that many more expectations are aroused than can be fulfilled. There do not exist today any reliable methods of forecasting (even in technology).

The third drawback is that our major attention, reflecting an aspect of our culture, becomes concentrated on "gadgets," and breezy claims are made that such gadgets will transform our lives. Not only do people forget the predicted gadgets that failed to

²³ Status information provided by Charles Casazza, Branch Chief, Legal Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Treasury Department, June 1967.

²⁴ Brydges, Earl W. The electronic solon. *In* National civic review, July 1965, p. 351.

²⁵ Wisconsin computerizes state law. Reprint from State government administration magazine, May 1967.

²⁶ Chartrand, Robert L. Information for the Congress: implications of automatic data processing. A presentation before the Technical Information Machine Systems Seminar, The American University, Washington, D.C., April 17, 1967. Figure 1, p. 14.

²⁷ McClory, Robert. An automatic data processing facility to support the Congress. Remarks in the House. Congressional record. [Daily ed.] (Washington), v. 112, October 19, 1966, p. 26787.

²⁸ Scott, Hugh. Remarks in the Senate during debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967. Congressional record. [Congressional record. [Daily ed.] (Washington), v. 113, February 16, 1967, p. S2124.

²⁹ Chartrand, Robert L. Automatic data processing for the Congress. *In* Extension of remarks of Honorable Robert McClory. Congressional record (Washington), v. 113, January 30, 1967, p. 1803.

appear—for example, the replacement of the daily newspaper by facsimile that would come out of the television set—but the startling claims of yesterday quickly become the prosaic facts of today.

Twenty-five years ago, the technology magazines were filled with the coming wonders of "fractional horsepower," which would lighten all our burdens. And although small motors with fractions of horsepower have been developed, they have also resulted in such things as electric toothbrushes and electric carving knives.

A STABLE FRAMEWORK

The simple point is that a complex society is not changed by a flick of the wrist. Considered from the viewpoint of gadgetry, the United States in the year 2000 will be more like the United States in the year 1967 than different.

The basic framework of day-to-day life has been shaped in the last 50 years by the ways the automobile, the airplane, the telephone and television have brought people together and increased the interactions among them. It is highly unlikely that in the next 33 years (if one takes the year 2000 literally, not symbolically) the impending changes in technology will radically alter this framework.

Supersonic transport will "tighten" the network and bring the world more directly into the domestic frame. The major challenges and problems already confronting our society, however—a livable physical environment, effective urban planning, the expansion of postgraduate education, the pressures of density and the reduction of privacy, the fragility of political institutions beset by many pressure groups—will extend to the end of the century.

This is not to say that substantial changes will not take place as they have been doing in the past 33 years. But one has to be clear about the character of such changes. In general, there are four sources of change in society, and they can be charted with differential ease.

The first source of change is technology. In the next 33 years, we are likely to see great changes growing out of the new biomedical engineering, the computer and possibly weather modification.

Biomedical engineering, particularly its possibilities of organ transplant, genetic modification and control of disease, promises a substantial increase in human longevity. Previous steps, principally the control of infant mortality, raised the average life expectancy; now the prolongation of life by the control of aging may be at hand. This may accentuate a tendency, already visible, in which the chief concern of a person (particularly in middle age) is not death from disease but staying young, thus strengthening the hedonistic elements in our culture.

The impact of the computer will be vast. We will probably see a national information-computer-utility system with tens of thousands of terminals in homes and offices "hooked" into giant central computers providing library and information services, retail ordering and billing services and the like. But while the social and economic consequences will be huge, the effect will be greater on the structure of intellectual life and the character of organizations than on the day-to-day life of the person.

Weather modification, still only on the horizon, would shape a control of environment men have dreamed of for thousands of years, but the working out of the economic and social arrangements would pose some difficult problems for human civilization.

In all this, one should note that "technology" is itself changing. Instead of a machine technology, we will have increasingly an "intellectual technology" in which such techniques as simulation, model construction, linear programming and operations research

will be hitched to the computers and will become the new tools of decision-making.

A PROBLEM OF SIZE

The second source of change, one of the most powerful engines in American society, represents the diffusion of existing goods and privileges in society, whether they be tangible goods or social claims on the community. This, in effect, is the realization of the promise of equality which underlies the founding of this country and the manifestation of Tocqueville's summation of American democracy: What the few have today, the many will demand tomorrow.

When diffusion begins to take rapid sway (as has recently been seen in higher education), it changes the size and scale of the servicing institution and, consequently, that institution's character. Dealing with such problems of size and scale and planning for the kind of institution we want becomes the urging task of anticipating, not predicting, the future; for example, the university should not become a corporate entity because of the pressure of size.

A third kind of change involves structural developments in society. The centralization of the American political system in the last 30 years has marked an extraordinary transformation of American life. It is the result, in part, of our becoming a national society through the new transportation and the mass media. But it also grew out of the need for central instrumentalities first to mediate the conflicts between large functional groups and later to mobilize the society because of the demands of war.

A different, more subtle structural change has been the transformation of the economy into a "postindustrial" society. The weight of the economy has shifted from the product sector to services; more importantly, the sources of innovation are becoming lodged in the intellectual institutions, principally the universities and research organizations, rather than in the older industrial corporations.

The consequences of such a change are enormous for the modes of access to place and privilege in the society. They make the universities the "gatekeepers" of society. They make more urgent the husbanding of "human capital" rather than financial, and they raise crucial sociological questions about the relationship of the new technocratic modes of decision-making to the political structures of society.

The fourth source of change—perhaps the most important and certainly the most refractory to prediction—is the relationship of the United States to the rest of the world. In the last 25 years, our lives have been transformed most drastically by our participation in World War II, by our military and political posture in the Cold War and by our relationship to the extraordinary number of new states that have emerged since 1945. The problem of detente in a nuclear age, the gap between rich and poor nations, the threatening role of "color" as a divisive political force, the changing balance of forces—both technological and moral—are all questions that reach from the present into the distant future.

We have begun to realize—and this is the positive side of the current interest in the year 2000—that it is possible to direct some of this change consciously, and because a normative commitment underlies any humanistic approach to social policy, we can try to widen the area of choice. Looking ahead, we realize that the rebuilding of American cities, for example, entails a 35-year cycle, and one can rebuild cities only by making long-range commitments.

In the process, we are also forced to consider the adequacy of our political mechanisms, since Congress neither has a capital budget nor budgets money for long-range commitments. Furthermore, one must question whether a national society can sensibly

be structured according to the present crazy-quilt pattern of 50 states and thousands of unwieldy municipalities.

In short, what matters most about the year 2000 is not the gadgets that might, on the serious side, introduce prosthesis in the human body or, on the lighter side, use silicones to lift wrinkles, but the kinds of social arrangements that can deal adequately with the problems we shall confront.

More and more we are becoming a "communal society" in which the public sector has a greater importance and in which the goods and services of the society—those affecting cities, education, medical care and the environment—will increasingly have to be purchased jointly. Hence, the problem of social choice and individual values—the question of how to reconcile conflicting individual desires through the political mechanism rather than the market—becomes a potential source of discord.

The relation of the individual to bureaucratic structures will be subject to even greater strain. The increasing centralization of government creates a need for new social forms that will allow the citizenry greater participation in making decisions. The growth of a large, educated professional and technical class, with its desire for greater autonomy in work, will force institutions to reorganize the older bureaucratic patterns of hierarchy and detailed specialization.

The individual will live longer and face the problem of renewed education and new careers. The family as the source of primordial attachment may become less important for the child, in both his early schooling and his emotional reinforcement.

This will be a more mobile and more crowded world, raising problems of privacy and stress. The new densities and "communications overload" may increase the potentiality for irrational outbursts in our society.

Finally, there is the growing disjunction between the "culture" and the "social structure." Society becomes more functionally organized, geared to knowledge and the mastery of complex bodies of learning. The culture becomes more hedonistic, permissive, expressive, distrustful of authority and of the purposive delayed-gratification of a bourgeois, achievement-oriented technological world. This tension between the "technocratic" and the "apocalyptic" modes, particularly among the intellectuals, may be one of the great ruptures in moral temper, especially in the universities.

MORE OPEN CONFLICT

The only prediction about the future that one can make with certainty is that public authorities will face more problems than they have at any previous time in history. This arises from some simple facts:

Social issues are more and more intricately related to one another because the impact of any major change is felt quickly throughout the national and even the international system. Individuals and groups, more conscious of these problems as problems, demand action instead of quietly accepting their fate.

Because more and more decisions will be made in the political arena than in the market, there will be more open community conflict. The political arena is an open cockpit where decision points are more visible than they are in the impersonal market; different groups will clash more directly as they contend for advantage or seek to resist change in society.

For all these reasons, the society of the year 2000 will be more fragile, more susceptible to hostilities and to polarization along many different lines. Yet to say this is not to surrender to despair, for the power to deal with these problems is also present.

It resides, first, in the marvelous productive capacity of our system to generate sufficient economic resources for meeting most

of the country's social and economic needs. It is latent in the flexibility of the American political system, its adaptability to change and its ability to create new social forms to meet these challenges—public corporations, regional compacts, nonprofit organizations, responsive municipalities and the like.

The problem of the future consists in defining one's priorities and making the necessary commitments. This is an intention of the Commission on the Year 2000.

VIETNAM

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to stop the increasing drain of American lives and national strength into South Vietnam by insisting that those in this area increase their war effort. Lacking this, those in South Vietnam are apt to feel that the execution of the war is our sole responsibility and none of theirs.

That there is danger of such a drift is evidenced by the fact that just recently President-elect Nguyen Van Thieu appeared on a radio-television program recorded in Saigon, urging that American troops should handle most of the heavy fighting in Vietnam. It would be interesting to know what prompted him to arrive at this conclusion.

That America is already doing more than its share in this war is evidenced by the fact that American casualties since January 1967, are now running almost twice as heavy as the Vietnamese casualties.

If we do not demand greater participation by the South Vietnamese in this war, Asians increasingly will be made to feel that their cause is just so long as they can fight to the last drop of American blood to advance and protect it.

The war in Vietnam can never be carried out to a successful conclusion until Asians of the Vietnam area are fired by the same spirit that drove the American Revolution to a successful end. The President of the United States should immediately issue a mandate that now is the time for all good Vietnamese and allied Asians to come to the aid of the country of Vietnam; that the Asian effort must be proportionately larger than America's.

American lives and vitality cannot continue to be spent on an Asian cause which Asians, themselves, will not recognize as being worthy.

WONDERFUL WISCONSIN WEEK

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on

next Sunday, the 17th of September, Wisconsinites will salute the start of a 7-day observance of "Wonderful Wisconsin Week." The theme for the festivities will be apropos, as it will be entitled "We Like It Here."

It is heartwarming to realize that a fierce State pride still exists in Wisconsin. Many of the so-called internationalists would have us believe that we should put the other nations of the world in a more favorable position than we do our home areas. I am happy to say that the citizens of Wisconsin are most singly proud of the State in which they reside, and of the accomplishments that Wisconsinites have attained throughout the years, and are indeed accomplishing daily. We are not isolationists by any stretch of the imagination, but we do recognize the tremendous importance of our own State. Our industry flourishes and grows. Our agriculture supplies Midwestern and in fact all of our Nation's markets with produce and milk and milk products with an abundance envied by our neighbors. Our tourist business attracts hundreds of thousands of out-of-State visitors in both summer and winter so that they may enjoy the boating, skiing, swimming, golfing, and so forth which are not readily available in their own locales.

Wisconsin can take great pride in the celebration which will present a varied program for each of the 7 days of "Wonderful Wisconsin Week." On the 17th of September, "Heritage Day" will be celebrated; the 18th will mark "Education and Youth Day"; "Government Day" will take place on Tuesday the 19th; Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, the 20th, 21st, and 22d will pay tribute to "Wisconsin at Work"; and Saturday the 23d will be "Hospitality Day."

I urge those of you who are thinking of journeying into the marvelous Midwest during the next 10 days to take the time to join with us in an examination of the assets and attributes of Wisconsin in the celebration of "Wonderful Wisconsin Week." Even a short exposure to our State will quickly convince you that we rightfully have a strong State pride. We hope that many of you will be able to attend the festivities.

22D NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CITIZENSHIP

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have called the attention of the House to "Wonderful Wisconsin Week" in other remarks today. I would also join with most of my colleagues in saluting the 22d National Conference on Citizenship which is to be held next week at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C. Many of us will participate in at least the get-acquainted session in the east room of the hotel on Monday morning between

8:30 and 9:30, and I hope that a large group from the Congress will be able to attend the workshops and discussions and to hear the banquet address of the very able Senator from Texas, JOHN G. TOWER.

TAFT CHALLENGES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ON STATISTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VIGORITO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the statement dated August 29 by Deputy Attorney General Warren Christopher in reply to criticism by Republican groups of the administration's war on crime deserves a direct retort. It evades questions, quotes meaningless statistics, pleads partisanship, and usurps credit where none is due.

The House Republican Task Force on Crime commented on the Attorney General's limitation of legal electronic surveillance and simply questioned why it was necessary to exceed the strict and perhaps excessive limitations of the Supreme Court outlined in the Berger decision. The task force asked what the logical purpose of the additional restrictive regulations was, and where the Attorney General derives the authority to establish them. These questions remain unanswered.

In another statement, 23 House Republicans, including myself, recently outlined a 12-point program for combating organized crime nationwide and asked a number of questions such as:

First. Why the activities of the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department have been dramatically reduced since 1964?

Second. Why the administration influenced the Crime Commission to reverse an earlier recommendation for wiretap legislation?

Third. Why the administration persists in its position that court authorized electronic surveillance is of little value despite statements to the contrary from almost every law enforcement official in the country?

Fourth. Why the administration has ignored almost every recommendation by the President's Crime Commission on organized crime?

These questions remain unanswered by Mr. Christopher and the Justice Department.

Instead, Mr. Christopher says FBI-investigated organized crime convictions rose 39 percent from the previous year and two new measures to aid the fight against organized crime are pending in Congress.

With Republican aid, these bills could be promptly passed—

Christopher comments. He adds—

The partisan obstruction of the Republicans only serves to interfere with the war against crime.

The two bills referred to have been the subject of legislative proposals since 1961. Both have received broad Republican support, both have been sponsored in this session of Congress, in House and Senate, by Republicans and Democrats

alike. These bills are bipartisan efforts, and were among recommendations of the President's Crime Commission.

With respect to the administration's statistical justification of its war on organized crime, we must note that it is carefully confined to FBI-investigated convictions. It makes no mention of who the subjects of conviction were or what their standing was in the hierarchy of organized crime. What of IRS-investigated organized crime convictions? Hitherto, they have accounted for 60 percent of the success of the entire Federal effort. In addition, how many "high echelon" organized crime figures are among those convicted? Conversely, how many numbers writers, petty bootleggers, prostitutes, racetrack touts, and similar small fish have found their way into their statistics?

Since the Justice Department cited the number of convictions in a selected area as a measure of their success in fighting organized crime, additional figures deserve comment. The President's Crime Commission called Cosa Nostra the core of organized crime and estimated its membership at some 5,000. Since 1961 only about 130 identified Cost Nostra members have been convicted by the Federal Government. That amounts to roughly 2.6 percent of Cosa Nostra membership for the entire 7-year period—a conviction rate of 0.4 percent per year. Current issues of Life magazine detail the dominance over the underworld of those remaining free.

And the 130 convictions represent the sum total of the efforts of 26 Federal investigative agencies, 94 U.S. attorney's offices and, of course, the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department.

Criticism of the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department is not intended. The section should not be dissuaded from prosecuting even low-level figures in whatever way they can. They are as much a part of organized crime as anyone else. In addition, no one can tell when a conviction might lead to important further prosecutions. It is a well known fact, however, that the high echelon racketeers—the syndicate gamblers, the mob leaders, Cosa Nostra members—are extremely well insulated from the day-to-day criminal activities they direct. As a result, they are extremely difficult to prosecute. The problem is basically one of uncovering evidence.

It is to the credit of the Organized Crime Section that they have accomplished even this much under present Justice Department rules laid down for them and the evidence gatherers they supervise. But the claimed import of their success is obviously quite misleading.

The most dramatic and typical issue is the authorization of court approved electronic surveillance, within constitutional limits, as one of the necessary tools for obtaining evidence against syndicate leaders. Until the Justice Department recognizes the need to utilize every legal weapon, the fight against crime will continue to be a losing battle.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement which has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I wish to commend the gentleman upon his bringing this matter to the attention of the House of Representatives. I know that the gentleman has given much thought and much study to this question. I am hopeful that as a result of the gentleman's contribution as well as the contribution of others who have similar ideas on this important problem that the House of Representatives will give serious consideration to the legislation pending before it so that we can get at the solution of this problem, a problem which is a very real one, and one in my opinion which can be solved through law, in large measure.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and for the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CLARIFY THE VIETNAM ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year a distinguished Senator made a remarkable proposal for solution of the Vietnam problem.

He said that the United States should simply declare itself a winner in the war and then pull out.

The idea was received in a humorous vein. Everyone had a good laugh about it. But now it appears that we might very well witness events in the next months which will follow closely that very same proposal.

This kind of magic will not develop all at once. It will evolve over a period of months, and, indeed, has already started. It began with Secretary McNamara's announcement that he was going to build some kind of barrier between North and South Vietnam ostensibly to cut down on infiltration of Ho Chi Minh's men and supplies from north to south.

It is highly unusual for a military commander, in time of war, to make a public announcement of a major military project designed to aid in the prosecution of the war unless the announcement is designed to serve a nonmilitary purpose.

McNamara's barrier between North and South Vietnam cannot possibly reduce infiltration significantly by itself. To be any where near effective the barrier must either continue westward across Laos or else follow the Laos-South Vietnam border southward through many, many miles of mountainous jungle.

Since neither of these extensions of the barrier is likely, the announcement of the barrier was intended for other purposes. It was meant as a preliminary step to a future McNamara news conference he can call to announce a dramatic reduction in infiltration.

With this move U.S. military action in Vietnam can be gradually slackened off and perhaps even some troops can be returned to the United States. This can be done with or without continuation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

But it seems likely that with infiltration reduced even a very small amount, reasonable justification can be found by the administration to stop the bombing. And with even a few American soldiers withdrawn, a basis can be found with Ho Chi Minh for an agreement to begin some form of talks.

The newly elected regime of South Vietnam is already referring to peace talks. The stage is being set for both sides in the war, after a process of evolving military and diplomatic maneuvers, to proclaim victory.

Each side will come off with a maximum of face-saving and will be able to say its objectives have been won. This might develop either with the actual conclusion of negotiations or with a stalemated conference.

THANKFUL

If this process should actually develop in fact, the American people, the Vietnamese people, and all the world will, of course, be thankful that the conflict will have been brought to an end.

But the question we should ask ourselves is whether President Johnson's stated objectives will have been met or not. In April of 1965 the President said the U.S. objective was a free and independent South Vietnam. He rejected any meaningless agreements as suitable basis for withdrawal of U.S. support for South Vietnam.

If, in 1968, a form of agreement results in lessened military activity and a partial withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam, and then leads in 1969 to a Communist takeover of South Vietnam, how can we justify today's effort in that tragic country?

If the administration harbors thoughts that this progression of events might actually develop then it has a deep moral obligation to set the facts before the people.

And yet the history of administration explanations of this war has been far from adequate. At no point in the Johnson administration has the reasoning behind our interest in Vietnam been quite clear to the people.

At various times we have been told that we are in Vietnam because of the SEATO treaty, because we need to save the Vietnamese people from a Communist future they do not want, or a combination of these and other reasons.

But the real issue is whether U.S. security is involved, and this point has never been adequately presented to the people. If it had been, the President would, I am convinced, have the support of the American people today and throughout the period of the conflict.

Also, and perhaps even more important, if the President had made clear our security interest in Vietnam, the opposition would have found our determination and national will to be sufficiently credible so that we never would have needed to come this far down the road of war with its immense cost and sacrifice of American life.

CLARIFICATION

Today across this country there is doubt and confusion running deep in the minds and hearts of thoughtful people. I call upon the President to restate the aims and objectives of our effort in Vietnam.

I ask him to sweep away the side issues and to deal directly with the heart of the matter: our U.S. national security. I ask him to say what he has not yet said about our interest in Vietnam.

If our national security is thought to be at stake in Vietnam then the President must say so directly and without qualification. In doing so he would unite the country behind him.

On the other hand, if our national security is not at issue, then it is my opinion that the American people favor a quick end to the war under almost any circumstances. But they will strongly oppose a staged conclusion to the fighting with paper agreements which will result in anything less than the President stated as his aims in April of 1965.

RUSSIA

What assurances do the American people have that the administration will not paper over a withdrawal from Vietnam, trying to make a defeat look like victory?

The byword in administration foreign policy is "building bridges" with Russia and Russia's East European satellites. And without the active help of Russia and Russia's satellite governments North Vietnam could not continue the war and still survive.

Our Government behaves toward Russia as though the cold war is all over. The theory is that if we only act friendly enough Russia will reciprocate no matter how much the Kremlin seems to be waging economic, diplomatic, and psychological war against us, and no matter how much military equipment Russia is pouring into Cuba, North Vietnam, the Arab countries, and other places where damage can be done to U.S. interests.

In effect, the Johnson administration has declared by itself that the cold war is over, and has withdrawn from the competition. It is only one more step to do the same in Vietnam—to declare the war over, and withdraw.

What are the reasons for concluding that our Government has pulled out of the competition with Russia?

Latin America is one reason. The State Department is so busy assuring itself that Castroite subversion is getting nowhere in Latin America, that when new cases of this subversion continue to appear the Department has no apparent policy with which to deal with it.

The proposed antiballistic-missile system is another reason. For many months we have asked Russia to enter into talks

designed to prevent the costly construction of a missile defense system in either country. And we have delayed the construction of such a system.

But Russia has gone right ahead to build her own antiballistic-missile system while leading our negotiators, evidently, to believe that talks might actually develop.

PROPAGANDA, TOO

This same illusion about Russia's behavior serves also to paralyze our activity on the propaganda front.

In March of 1966, the United States and Russia entered into a cultural agreement with great fanfare. The agreement was actually a renewal of the earlier and similar agreement which had been openly broken by Russia on at least one major occasion.

The 1966 agreement clearly stated the specific details of exchanges between the two countries of scientific, technical, educational and cultural materials and people. For example it provided for the exchange "on the basis of reciprocity" of an American magazine distributed in Russia and a Russian magazine distributed in the United States.

It specifically provided for increases in circulation of the magazines to be agreed upon jointly. The entire agreement was carefully and repeatedly based on the idea of reciprocity: one magazine exchanged each way.

Then, apparently to the surprise of the State Department, a second Russian magazine appeared on U.S. newsstands in January of this year. The new magazine was called "Sputnik," a Reader's Digest-type publication printed in English in Finland, and shipped into this country through the Port of New York.

The new magazine was, of course, not covered by the 1966 agreement or any other agreement with Russia.

I wrote to the State Department a few days later to ask what steps were being taken to seek reciprocity with Russia in the form of arrangements for a new American magazine distributed in Russia.

The State Department wrote in response that a request to this effect had been addressed to Russia and a response was then awaited.

In August, 7 months later, I again wrote the State Department to ask the status of the matter. They responded saying that efforts were continuing to arrange for distribution of an American magazine in the Soviet Union.

It is not my contention here that we should protect the American people from exposure to Russian propaganda materials. It is my contention, however, that Russia continually evades and defies agreements in her continuing conduct of cold war tactics while our Government appears to be either unwilling or unable to meet the challenge.

We should demand reciprocity in the exchange of publications in accord with the 1966 cultural agreement that was hailed by administration backers as such a diplomatic achievement for the United States.

We should demand that Russian supply ships stay away from North Vietnam or

risk damage from American bombers engaged in the conduct of war.

We should demand that Russian ships stay away from Cuba or risk action that we would take in accord with President Kennedy's quarantine of 1962.

And until the administration moves in this direction the American people should ask that American objectives in Vietnam be clarified before the tragic course of war be continued.

AMERICA'S FIGHTING MEN UNDERSTAND WHY WE ARE IN VIETNAM

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, do the American people support President Johnson in Vietnam?

One indication that they do is the fact that 100,000 members of the U.S. Army have volunteered for duty in Vietnam during the past 3 years. And of 200,000 American troops stationed in Europe, one in 20 have asked for transfers to Vietnam in the first 6 months of this year.

In addition, 20 percent of the marines now in Vietnam have requested further combat service after completing their 13-month tour of duty.

I believe these facts indicate that our people understand the meaning and purpose of our commitment to South Vietnam. And this understanding is certainly reflected in the spirit of our fighting men now in Vietnam or among those desiring to serve there.

In a recent editorial, the Kansas City Times cites these statistics to conclude that our people understand "that to fight armed communism in Vietnam is the best way to prevent a wider war that would directly threaten the United States and its free world allies."

The Kansas City Times challenges a recent article in the London Times which claimed that as many as 1,000 Americans had abandoned their units in Europe, largely to escape the Vietnam combat zone.

The Kansas City Times reports that the present list of Army deserters in Europe totals 338, many of whom took such drastic action due to personal difficulties that had nothing to do with Vietnam.

As for the general attitude of young Americans in our Armed Forces, the fact that 100,000 of them have volunteered for Vietnam indicates to me that America has nothing to worry about when it comes to the spirit and dedication of their young people.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD the excellent editorial from the Kansas City Times:

SURGE OF U.S. VOLUNTEERS IN THE VIETNAM WAR

Here is a piece of news that we wish the London Times would pick up to atone for

the out-of-character, journalistic dunderheadedness that it committed the other day:

More than 100,000 members of the U.S. Army have volunteered for duty in Vietnam during the last three years. The breakdown for the total of 103,635 volunteers is 9,435 officers and 94,200 enlisted men. Also, of the more than 200,000 U.S. troops stationed in Europe, approximately 10,500, or one in 20, have applied for transfer to Southeast Asia during the first six months of this year. In addition, headquarters of the Fleet Marine Force for the Pacific reports that 20 per cent of the marines in Vietnam have requested further combat service after completing their 13-month tours.

But the prestigious London Times has published a conflicting—and erroneous—version of mass desertions in Europe by American soldiers determined to avoid fighting in Vietnam. The Times sent out a task force of reporters who claimed that as many as 1,000 Americans had abandoned their units in Europe, largely to escape Asian combat.

The London newspaper displays what, at best, is naivete in attributing the same motive to a large number of men without having interviewed more than a sampling. Of course the Times could not know the motivation of 1,000 deserters who would never be available for comment because most do not exist. The facts are quite different.

In response to the London Times account, the U.S. Army headquarters at Heidelberg, Germany, reports the present list of long-term absentees as totaling 338, some dating back several years. This figure is small for so large a U.S. garrison. Moreover, many of the deserters made their move after getting into personal entanglements that had nothing to do with Vietnam.

As for the general attitude of young Americans toward the war, of course there are many who want no part of military service if they can avoid it. Those youths appear most concerned over the perils and privations of combat in Vietnam. But among those who eventually find themselves on active duty through the draft or by enlistment, an entirely different attitude prevails.

A generation that many of its seniors feared was "soft" has come through magnificently in the hard tasks of Vietnam. Some American commanders declare the servicemen of today to be the best that this country has ever had. These men are not running out on the war. Their actions support the viewpoint that to fight armed communism in Vietnam is the best way to prevent a wider war that would directly threaten the U.S. and its free world Allies. The London Times needs to get its facts straight.

PROVISION OF CREDIT TO KINGS RIVER WATER USERS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATHIAS], I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for credit to Kings River water users in our districts for excess payments under their repayment obligation contracts for the years 1954 and 1955.

These water users are members of the

Kings River Water Association and the purpose of this legislation is to give the Department of Interior authority to correct certain bookkeeping entries to prevent an inequitable collection of water storage contract repayment funds.

Congress authorized the construction of the Pine Flat Dam and reservoir on the Kings River in California in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Agreement was reached that the water users would pay \$14,250,000 under the terms of a repayment contract entered into after a long period of negotiation. Prior to the conclusion of a final contract, an interim contract was signed which resulted in the payment during 1954 and 1955 of \$1,098,579.92 in excess of the costs of operation and maintenance of the project facilities for those years.

For all of the years following 1955, under the terms of a provision inserted in the temporary contracts, credit was given for such overpayments.

The Department of Interior has determined that there is no authority of law which permits it to give credit for the years 1954 and 1955. Without such credit, the water users would be required to repay not the agreed sum of \$14,250,000 but an amount of \$15,348,579.92. This was not contemplated by either the Government or the water users and would amount to an overpayment to the United States.

The passage of this bill will not result in any expenditure of Government funds nor a refund to the water users but merely a credit on the books of the Department of the Interior so that with the eventual payment of the repayment obligation, there will not be an overpayment by the several water districts in our area and equity will be provided.

THE CAMP ROBERTS PROJECT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which recently appeared in the Los Angeles Times concerning efforts to send 2,400 youngsters from Watts to summer camp at the Army's Camp Roberts. At the time the editorial was written, there were still some details to be ironed out. I am pleased to add that all the arrangements were successfully completed and that the children did get to camp.

The editorial points out the tremendous cooperation between governmental, military, and union officials along with representatives of the private sector. It is cooperation such as this which is the backbone of our efforts to eradicate poverty. It is cooperation such as this which has marked the activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its efforts to help the poor. I would hope

that as the Congress prepares to consider the OEO legislation the same spirit of cooperation will be at work.

The editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 19, 1967]

NEW SUMMER "CAMPS" FOR SLUM YOUTH

A highly imaginative program to provide summer vacations for underprivileged youngsters at military bases could begin sending 2,400 Watts young people to Camp Roberts this week—if final arrangements can be quickly completed.

Still to be settled are important questions of final state approval and of governmental, military, union and private sector coordination.

Remarkable progress through government channels already has been achieved. The proposal was first made to Washington only three weeks ago by Ted Watkins, head of the union-sponsored Watts Labor Community Action Council.

The idea was picked up and pushed by Vice President Humphrey, as chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's approval assured the cooperation of military officials.

Success of the pilot project at Camp Roberts could lead to similar camping experiences next year for as many as one million needy boys and girls at military posts throughout the country.

Labor unions and private corporations responded on short notice to the call for necessary camp personnel, equipment and food. Camp counselors and teachers are being recruited, and a request for transportation help has been made to Southern Pacific officials.

The program is the latest and most ambitious anti-poverty effort by the Labor Community Action Council and by Watkins, who is on leave from the United Auto Workers union.

Although the Camp Roberts project will include disadvantaged young people from 7 to 24, the big majority will be 13 and younger with those over 18 serving as counselors.

All who have worked so diligently to set up the camp program deserve praise and support. The Times earnestly hopes that they have made a successful start on what will become a nationwide program of outdoor opportunity for slum children.

IN OPPOSITION TO INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF THE OCEAN FLOOR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker in just the last two decades we have seen an almost unparalleled expansion of interest in exploration and exploitation of the ocean floor. The surge of many groups to capture and capitalize on the vast potentialities of this underwater treasure trove is parallel, in many respects, to the similar surge which engulfed our Nation in the 19th century when countless thousands pushed west in quest of that region's likewise boundless resources. We are all aware of the strife and conflict that were a part of the development of the West. The legendary land grabs, range wars,

and gold rushes make up a vivid, yet regrettable, chapter in our country's history. The present and possible problems facing us, as a member of the international community, are far greater and potentially more destructive than those that so long inflamed the Old West.

All of us, I think, want to avoid a repetition of history's bitter lessons. We all want to avoid unnecessary conflict which might result between nations competing to tap the resources of the ocean deep. Few, however, agree on how this aim should be realized. There is substantial division on this question among legal scholars, oceanographers and, yes, politicians.

In recent months it has become increasingly clear that the administration has committed itself to a single course of action. It has apparently concluded that title to the ocean floor should be given to a single international body. It has painstakingly constructed a case to support this view. Recently President Johnson said:

We must insure that the deep and the ocean bottoms are and remain the legacy of all human beings.

Vice President HUMPHREY, in a speech delivered on July 29 of this year, restated the President's commitment and added:

It is essential that we work with all countries, including the Soviet Union, bilaterally and through international organization in exploring, understanding, and using the seas and their resources.

One of our country's delegates to the 21st session of the United Nations, Idaho Senator FRANK CHURCH, has been most explicit. On February 15, 1967, Senator CHURCH proposed that our Nation should support "conferring title on the United Nations to mineral resources on the ocean floor beyond the Continental Shelf, under an international agreement regulating their development."

Within the last few days I have received reliable reports which indicate that our Nation's representatives to the United Nations will, in the upcoming session of the General Assembly, support a program to vest control of the ocean bottom in the United Nations.

A TRAGIC AND MONUMENTAL ERROR

Mr. Speaker, blithely giving the U.N. title to the vast resources of the ocean floor would be a tragic and monumental error. At this time, no proposal can be intelligently considered. At present, the international community cannot even agree on what the term "ocean floor" connotes. The absence of widespread acceptance of a common definition of the parameters of the ocean floor means that discussion of this subject is, at best, muddled with uncertainty and that debate of the subject is virtually impossible.

Of even greater concern to me is the fact that we, the Congress and the American people, do not now know the extent of the ocean's resources; nor do we understand adequately the implications of their development for our country. We have not fully considered the full legal and political implications of any such move. We have not, in short, defined what our Nation's self-interest is. Until

these questions are considered and our self-interest is defined, how can we expect to proceed on anything but pious hopes and good intentions?

Last year, the Congress authorized the establishment of two groups to study the ocean deep and participate in defining our Nation's vital interests in its future development. The two committees—the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources—have been selected. Among their membership are numbered some of the world's leading authorities on this subject.

Both these committees have met several times. They are working industriously to prepare recommendations on how our country should proceed in its efforts to marshal the resources of the ocean deep. To take irreversible steps to vest the resources of the ocean floor in an international body before these distinguished bodies have had an opportunity to speak on the subject would make a mockery of their efforts as well as the legislation passed by the Congress to bring them into being.

WIDESPREAD OPPOSITION

The several leading groups which have considered the prospect of vesting the control of the ocean floor in the United Nations have been almost unanimous in their opposition to unilateral control of the ocean floor. In their recent meeting at Long Beach, Calif., delegates to the American Bar Association adopted a resolution stating, in part:

Prior to framing any policy *vis-a-vis* other nations with respect to sea resources not covered by existing law, the United States Government (should) be urged to review thoroughly the issues at stake in consultation with representatives . . . competent in the field of international law, with scientific and technical experts, and with leaders of American industry interested in oceanic development.

The National Oceanography Association's president expressed his opinion that—

Conferring title to mineral resources on the deep ocean floor on the United Nations or any other group at this time would be premature and ill-advised.

The American Legion has stated that it opposes giving to the United Nations title to off-shore property, regardless of location.

THE UNITED NATIONS QUESTIONABLE CAPABILITY

I am not persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that international control of the ocean floor is feasible or desirable. Were I of this persuasion, I would be hard pressed to justify turning the task of managing one-half of the earth's surface over to the United Nations. This organization's checkered history in dealing with less complicated and equally sensitive questions calls its capability into question.

From a political standpoint, the United Nations is encumbered by the fact that in seeking solutions all its parliamentary checks would be effective. Its actions would be determined by all nations—the great as well as the small, the landlocked and the insular—exercising a single vote.

Yet, the omnipresent veto would also be available to the members of the Security Council. The Soviet Union could therefore, as it has so often in the past, exercise its veto to frustrate the will of the other nations of the world.

The task of administering one-half of the earth's surface is immense. The job of formulating policies, developing procedures, and carrying out the day-to-day responsibilities for controlling the exploration and exploitation of this immense area would require a quality and quantity of administrative expertise of great proportions. I seriously question whether the United Nations, burdened as it is with the political problems of a deeply troubled world, should be asked to assume yet another burden when it is obvious to all that it is straining under the weight of the problems already upon it.

Based on our experience to date, it would seem, Mr. Speaker, that should future events dictate the desirability of some form of multilateral arrangements for administering the ocean floor, the most workable approach would be a regional one. Recent experience in the North Sea as well as the Pacific indicates that workable agreements can be made by the interested countries of the region to govern the use of undersea resources.

A RESOLUTION OF OPPOSITION

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution, today, which would make clear the opposition of this Congress to any move to vest title to the ocean floor in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a copy of the resolution:

H.J. RES. 820

A joint resolution in opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whereas strong efforts are being exerted by certain groups and individuals to immediately place the United Nations in control of the resources of the bed of the deep ocean beyond the Continental Shelf; and

Whereas our national goals for the development of the ocean floors resources have not been clearly defined, nor has an approach to the development of these resources been formulated; and

Whereas at present we have only limited understanding of the extent of the undersea resources, the means of obtaining access to them, the conditions for processing and marketing them, and the impact which activities connected with their extraction and mining will have on other uses of the sea, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States in 1966 enacted Public Law 89-454 for the expressed purpose of establishing two official bodies—the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources—to identify national objectives concerning undersea resources and recommend Federal programs to accomplish these aims, and

Whereas a number of highly responsible national organizations, representing a broad segment of the American public as well as many of the parties interested and experienced in the development of undersea resources have expressed opposition to conferring title at this time to such undersea

resources upon the United Nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that any action at this time to vest control of deep ocean resources in an international body would be premature and ill-advised, and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States memorialize the President to instruct American representatives of the United Nations to oppose any action at this time to vest control of the resources of the deep sea beyond the Continental Shelves of the United States.

JAPAN'S TAKEO MIKI: A CHAMPION OF JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as most Members of Congress are no doubt aware, the sixth meeting of the Joint Japan-United States Ministerial-Cabinet Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs convened this morning here in Washington. The idea of such top-level meetings was agreed to by the late President Kennedy and the late Prime Minister Ikeda as an opportunity not only for certain American Cabinet Secretaries and their counterpart Japanese Ministers to become acquainted on a personal basis but also to discuss frankly and freely problems of mutual concern and interest. President Johnson has strongly endorsed and supported the continuance of these meetings. Only with Canada does the United States have similar high-level exchanges.

The first of these annual meetings was held in Tokyo some 6 years ago in 1961. Since then, the meetings have been alternated between the Japanese capital and Washington.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk heads the U.S. delegation, which includes Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, and Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Foreign Minister Takeo Miki heads the Japanese delegation, which includes Minister of Finance Mikio Mizuta, Minister of Agriculture and Forestry Tadao Kuraishi, Minister of International Trade and Industry Wataro Kanno, Minister of Transportation Takeo Ohashi, Minister of Labor Takashi Hayakawa, and Director General of the Economic Planning Agency Kiichi Miyazawa.

U.S. Ambassador to Japan, U. Alexis Johnson, and Japan's Ambassador to the United States, Takeso Shimoda, will also participate in the meetings.

Because Foreign Minister Miki heads the Japanese delegation, members may be interested in some details regarding his career and his philosophy.

Born some 60 years ago, he spent part of his youth in the United States and, accordingly, has many personal friends among Japanese Americans and others both in Hawaii and on the continental mainland. His long record of advocating friendship and cooperation with the United States in promoting the peace and the prosperity of the Pacific is second to none. Indeed, in the difficult years before World War II, he was among the very few Japanese who publicly urged this friendship and cooperation with the United States.

A year ago, last September, the University of Southern California which he attended for a time in the early 1930's at a special convocation conferred upon him an honorary doctor of laws degree in recognition of his leadership in promoting not only United States-Japan relations but the rule of law in international relations.

An excellent summary of Foreign Minister Miki's philosophy and objectives is contained in some excerpts from a speech which he made in Japan recently and which was printed in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin this past Saturday, September 9.

There is also in the East magazine, in its October-November 1967 issue, some background information concerning Mr. Miki and a summary of his basic concepts in the area of Japan's foreign policies.

I believe that both articles are of interest to the Members of Congress, and I insert both of these revealing features in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 9, 1967]

JAPAN HOPES COOPERATION WILL UNITE ASIANS

(NOTE.—Japan's foreign minister, Takeo Miki, is flying to Washington this weekend for the sixth meeting of the U.S.-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.)

(One of his goals will be to encourage both his nation and the U.S. to give more help to the underdeveloped nations of Asia.)

(Following are excerpts of remarks he made recently explaining his thoughts about a greater Asian role for Japan and other "have" nations.)

In December last year, when I assumed the post of Foreign Minister, I said that I would like to promote Japan's Asia-Pacific policy. Since then, Japan's Asia-Pacific policy has created interest both in this country and abroad. Today, I would like to express my thinking on Japan's Asia-Pacific policy as well as Japan's economic co-operation.

It has always been my belief that one of the biggest tasks confronting the world in the future is how to cope with the gradually expanding disparity between advanced and developing countries. In other words, a solution to the so-called "North-South" problem, I believe, is one of the most crucial tasks to be tackled by the world in the future.

The advanced countries are constructing affluent societies supported by their huge volume of production and consumption. On the other hand, developing countries are far from creating abundant societies. As a matter of fact, most of the people in these countries are living on a minimum subsistence level and are even not certain of tomorrow. The fact is that even a little increase in the production of foodstuffs cannot cope with the increase in population.

The increase rate of the Gross National Product of the developing nations averages 4 per cent annually, but the population in-

crease rate is 2.5 per cent. Therefore, the per capita increase rate of the GNP comes to only 1.5 per cent, indicating the extreme seriousness of the living conditions in these countries. The fact that these people constitute two-thirds of the entire population of the world indicates the seriousness of the problem.

I sometimes feel apprehensive that world peace and prosperity might disintegrate from this direction if something is not done about it soon. Peace and prosperity cannot be attained merely by praying for them. The key to the attainment of peace and prosperity, I believe, lies in efforts toward the elimination, one by one, of the conditions which are proving to be obstacles to the achievement of peace and prosperity. The biggest and most serious problem obstructing the attainment of peace and prosperity in the world today, I believe, is the problem of the dire poverty of the people in the developing countries who constitute two-thirds of the world's population.

Let us take the Vietnam War as an example. The cause of the war can be traced to the following developments. The Diem regime failed to come up to the expectations of the people of Vietnam in tackling the problem of poverty. As a result, the people began to vent their dissatisfaction on the Diem policies, but the regime failed to cope with the problem with constructive measures. On the contrary, the Diem regime tried to suppress the people, thus intensifying their dissatisfaction. This dissatisfaction spread into a wide-scale anti-Government movement, which in turn was utilized by Communist elements in North Vietnam, resulting in the outbreak of the war. The people's dissatisfaction against poverty is the cause of civil war.

Asia is not only the most populous area in the world today but it is fraught with some of the most serious problems in the world. Without a peaceful and prosperous Asia, there can be no peace and prosperity in the world. All the world is yearning for a stabilized Asia today and it is the duty of Asia to realize this hope. But in order to bring about a stabilized Asia, it is first necessary to eliminate poverty among its peoples. The per capita annual income of the peoples in Asia averages less than \$100, compared with the annual income of \$3,000 of the people living in the United States and the \$700 of the Japanese.

However, the problem of poverty is impossible to be solved by the efforts of Asia alone, no matter how hard it tries. I believe it is necessary for the world in general and the countries located in the Asia-Pacific area, in particular, to co-operate in tackling and solving the problem of Asian poverty.

Particularly in the case of Japan, which is a contact point between the countries in Asia and those in the Pacific area, is destined, I believe, to play the role of a bridge to link the advanced countries of the Pacific area with Asia.

The Kennedy round negotiations have been concluded satisfactorily. This was a round for the advanced industrial nations, but the next round will be for the developing countries. The "North-South" problem is increasingly becoming a grave world issue. I believe that we should tackle the "North-South" problem in Asia more seriously. This is the background of my thinking about advocating the importance of an Asia-Pacific policy for Japan.

The term Asia-Pacific seems simple enough, yet it contains numerous differing aspects. For example, within it are represented the Orient and the Occident, the yellow race and the white race, developing nations and advanced nations and two different groups of regional societies which have been nurtured in different types of culture and traditions. The only common foundation on which the

region stands is a mutual yearning for the construction of a more peaceful and affluent society.

If the Asia-Pacific region should succeed in establishing strong ties within itself, it would contribute immensely toward the solution of the "North-South" problem. At the same time, it would bring about a rapprochement between the Orient and the Occident and be of major significance to the progress of mankind. However, I must admit that this is not an easy problem. Yet, nothing can be achieved unless we actually try to do something about it.

I believe that there are four aspects in implementing an Asia-Pacific policy: The first aspect concerns that of enlightenment. In other words, there is the need to arouse an awareness among the nations of Asia and the Pacific that they are in the same boat and are sharing the same destiny.

The second aspect is that concerning regional co-operation in Asia. I attended the second Ministerial Conference for the Development of Southeast Asia in Manila in April and I noticed that there was a rising trend among the participating nations for the realization of regional co-operation in Asia. The stage is now set for the actual implementation of regional co-operation programs.

For example, the Asian Development Bank, with its headquarters in Manila, has been opened for business. An Agricultural Development Fund will be set up as a special fund within the Asian Development Bank and we are now in the stage of soliciting many nations to contribute to the fund.

Preparations have also been initiated for the establishment of two fishery development centers, one in Bangkok and the other in Singapore.

Most of the Asian countries have acquired political independence after the war and begun to push programs for industrialization in an effort to achieve economic self-support. However, they recognize, through their experience, that it is impossible to achieve economic independence suddenly without following tried economic laws.

Consequently, the thinking of the various countries has now become more unpretentious. They are beginning to realize the need for efforts to attain self-support and for regional cooperation. I believe that in response to these constructive tendencies, Japan should co-operate in fields of capital, technology and ideas. It is my intention to further promote Japan's effective co-operation in these fields in the future. This is the second aspect of my efforts.

The third aspect is promoting co-operation among the advanced nations of the Pacific area. This does not mean the establishment of a "rich man's club" nor the monopolization of the benefits accrued. It also does not mean the creation of a closed or inward-looking bloc.

Today, we are in an era where economics and trade should be considered from a world-wide point of view. However, there exist a number of problems in the countries of the Pacific area which are peculiar to that region. On the other hand, there are numerous benefits that could be accrued through regional co-operation and it would be of significance to deepen co-operative relations among the countries.

The fourth aspect concerns the "North-South" issue in the Asia-Pacific area. In a nutshell, this aspect concerns the necessity of the "have" nations in the Pacific area assisting the "have not" countries in Asia. This, I believe, is the most important aspect of an Asia-Pacific policy.

In terms of 1964 figures, assistance to the developing nations in the world on a per capita basis is \$4.3 for Latin American countries, \$6.2 for countries in Africa, and \$3.1 for countries in Asia. As the figures indicate,

aid to Asian countries is only half of that extended to countries in Africa. Of the countries in Asia, aid to the nations in Southeast Asia amounts to only \$2.5 per capita.

This figure indicates that Southeast Asia is almost a "forgotten" area. I have appealed at every available opportunity to the advanced countries in the world to double their assistance to the countries in Asia. I have appealed time and again, particularly to the advanced countries in the Pacific area, which have close relations with Asian countries, to increase their assistance. It is my intentions to repeat such appeals in the future whenever the opportunity arrives. This fourth aspect of my efforts, I believe, is the most important of all.

[From the East magazine]

A STATESMAN AND HIS PLAN: "ASIA AND PACIFIC NEIGHBORS" IN SOLIDARITY—LIFE AND OPINION OF TAKEO MIKI, THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(NOTE.—Which way will Japan turn, to the East or to the West? This is one of the great enigmas of modern international relations. In a recent exclusive interview with the East, Mr. Miki, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, gave his views concerning this and other pertinent problems.)

THE JOB AND THE MAN

Mr. Miki's secretary kindly provided us with a schedule of a typical day in the Foreign Minister's busy life, Friday June 30, 1967:

10:00: See Prime Minister of Ceylon off at Tokyo International Airport. 10:45: See Prime Minister and Mrs. Sato off to attend the presidential inauguration ceremonies in Korea, also at Tokyo International Airport. 10:00-1:00: Attend Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs at the House of Representatives. 1:00-3:00: Attend official funeral service of a prominent Liberal-Democratic Party member at Aoyama Cemetery. 2:30-4:30: Preparations for the ASPAC (Asia-Pacific Council) in the Minister's office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Appointment with the new Japanese Ambassador to Paraguay. 4:30-4:45: Appointment with the new Swiss Ambassador at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 4:45-5:00: Appointment with the new Vietnamese Ambassador, also at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 5:00-5:05: Appointment with the new Japanese Ambassador to the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). 5:05-5:15: Appointment with the Hungarian Ambassador. 5:15-5:30: Appointment with the Soviet Ambassador. News conference in the news conference room of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 5:30-8:30: Informal meeting with party colleagues at a Japanese restaurant. 8:30: Party at another restaurant for the newspaper men attending the ASPAC.

This tight schedule is a reflection of the complex duties of the Japanese Foreign Minister whose task is to preserve a delicate balance between East and West.

The man in charge of this delicate balance is rather short, with up-turned brows, a squarish chin and sharp penetrating eyes. When he smiles, however, his eyes take on a gentle aspect. Externally, at least, he is typically Japanese. The many and varied experiences of a long, hard political career have left him with a clear, crisp way of speaking. He is one of few Japanese statesmen who can combine logic, eloquence and persuasiveness in his speeches.

A VARIED EARLY CAREER

Mr. Miki does not base his success on an established reputation in some other field or high social connections. He is a career politician who entered politics after university and has never looked back.

He was born in 1907, the only son of a farmer in a small village north of Tokushima

in Shikoku. His family were of the typical rural middle class; devout Buddhists who sold fertilizer on the side. In keeping with the patriotic fervor resulting from the recent Japanese victory over Russia, they named their son Takeo, which refers to samurai.

Following his parents' wishes that he become a business man, Takeo Miki entered the commerce department of Meiji University. His strong feeling for justice and concern with social matters led to an early interest in politics. After one semester at the university, he persuaded his parents to let him travel around the world for one year and three months.

Nowadays, most young people travel only for pleasure but for young Takeo Miki, travel offered much more. In conservative and ultra-nationalistic Japan, traveling abroad was still rare and adventurous. The international situation—the Great Depression in America, Fascism in Germany and Italy, early Communism in the Soviet Union—offered boundless opportunities for a young, active mind. Miki felt that he had to see the world, at any cost.

After returning home, he became aware how self-righteous and narrow-minded most Japanese politicians were. Unable to find mental-satisfaction at home, his quest for knowledge took him back to the United States where he entered Southwestern University. Here he was able to obtain an international outlook impossible in conservative Japan. At this time he decided to enter politics.

On returning to Japan, he entered Meiji University once again, majoring in law. He graduated when he was 30 years old in 1937, in the same year that the Hayashi Cabinet dissolved the Diet. The political parties of the time had lost the confidence of the people and a political cleanup was in order. The minimum age to run in an election was thirty and Miki decided that he would lose no time. Luckily, his home constituency, Tokushima Prefecture, looked favorably on younger candidates. In spite of strong opposition, Miki's eloquence won him the seat.

A PLEDGE TO JAPANESE-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

Three months after his election, in July, 1937, Japan embarked on its undeclared war in China, which attracted international rebuke. Japanese-American relations were deteriorating daily and many felt that war between the two countries was inevitable. Mr. Miki, with his broader outlook on international affairs, saw that something must be done. He decided to hold a meeting in Hibiya Public Hall in June, 1939, to advocate a strengthening of friendship between Japan and the United States. This anti-war stand was one of the few instances of anyone defying the militarists at such a late stage.

Partly out of respect for such courage and partly out of curiosity, the hall was filled to capacity. Right-wing hecklers were on hand to distribute propaganda pamphlets but the meeting continued.

The American Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Grew, was very much impressed with this show of bravery in a country where freedom of speech was so severely curtailed. The noted Senator from Idaho, William Borah, wrote a letter of encouragement and made a speech in the Senate in which he appealed for support of the Miki Movement. Anti-Japanese sentiment was, however, strong in the United States at the time and a boycott of Japanese goods was in force. The wife of former President Hoover even changed from silk to cotton stockings.

In this tense atmosphere, Mr. Miki organized the Japan-American Friendship Society and devoted himself to preserving peace. He was fighting an up-stream battle, and nothing could stop a war which by this time had become inevitable.

In 1942, with the Tojo Cabinet in power, he ran for re-election. During this wartime election, the government classified candidates in two groups—recommended and non-recommended. Mr. Miki was naturally in the latter group, but in spite of considerable interference from military agents and the police, he won the election, a rare thing for a so-called "non-recommended candidate." Since the war, he has won ten elections by a large majority. His consistent support of peace has always proven popular with the voters.

After the war Mr. Miki organized a party on a progressive conservative platform. This party later joined another progressive party which eventually merged with the ruling Liberal Democratic party. Mr. Miki has occupied many influential positions in his party and held three cabinet portfolios before becoming Foreign Minister: Minister of International Trade and Industry, Minister of Transportation and Minister of Home Affairs. His stress on following a logical policy has prevented him from becoming involved in the usual party intrigues and power struggles.

Mr. Miki leads a simple home life with little of the eccentricities of the old-style politicians. Raising potted plants and practicing calligraphy are his only pastimes.

THE ASIA-PACIFIC PLAN

Soon after he became Minister of Foreign Affairs in December, 1966, Mr. Miki announced his long-range "Asia-Pacific Plan" which represents the very essence of his policy. All of the details are not clear as yet but even in its early stages, the plan has attracted considerable attention both in Japan and abroad.

Mr. Miki explains his plan as follows:

"One of the major problems in the world today is the so-called 'North and South' problem. Two thirds of the world's population lives in underdeveloped countries. The economic gap between the 'have' and 'have not' nations is ever-widening and without some basic solution to this dilemma, world peace is a long way off."

The Foreign Minister claims to have devised his Asia-Pacific Plan in an attempt to solve this problem. In Asia, it is necessary to develop the poorer countries and combat poverty. For instance, poverty and misgovernment are at the root of the Vietnam problem which can only be solved by cooperation of all nations in the Pacific Area.

The East. Now that the general scale of the plan is clear, would you mind giving us some more details?

Mr. MIKI. First of all, we have to develop a sense of solidarity in Asia and the Pacific Area. I stressed this point at the Asian and Pacific Ministerial Conference in July and I believe that there was some positive response. If there is no peace in Asia, there can be no peace in the Pacific area. In the same way, all nations facing the Pacific must contribute if there is to be any advances made in Asia. It is essential to realize that both of these concepts are one and the same.

Secondly, it is necessary to promote full cooperation between the various parts of Asia. In this respect, Japan has led the way at the Ministerial Conference for Southeast Asian Development, and in the establishment of the Asian Development Bank and the Agriculture Development Fund in Southeast Asia. There is now a strong tendency in Asia to solve economic problems in a practical way without resorting to politics and ideologies.

Thirdly, there must be mutual cooperation between the more advanced countries facing the Pacific. These five nations—Japan, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand—must make a combined effort through trade and aid to help their less fortunate neighbors.

The next problem is to find a means of providing closer connections between the highly developed countries in the Pacific Area and the underdeveloped countries in Asia. Since it is not possible to form an equivalent of the EEC, I would suggest the establishment of several cooperative projects, like the Asian Development Bank. A Settlement Bank is one possibility. The whole matter is a long-range plan which first must obtain the consent and cooperation of the United States.

I feel that the United States is gaining a better understanding of Asia through the Vietnam war. If they would only carry their plans one step further and turn their efforts to peaceful and constructive purposes, there would be no wars like the one in Vietnam.

Let me outline briefly what these advanced countries have done so far in Asia. In 1964, each person in Latin America received US\$4.30 and in Africa US\$6.20, but in Asia the figure was only US\$3.10. In Southeast Asia, it was even lower—US\$2.50 per head. Excluding Vietnam, the figure drops even lower for the remaining countries in Southeast Asia—only US\$1.50 per head. I miss no opportunity to persuade the more highly developed countries to step up their aid in Asia.

The East. I can see your fundamental ideas concerning the implementation of this plan. It seems that Japan will act as a bridge between the two groups of countries since Japan stands at the crossroads between the East and West. But is this really feasible? In economic development, for example, Japan seems to be veering strongly to the West.

Mr. MIKI. This is why I feel that Japan must help the lesser developed nations first as much as possible; otherwise it will be hard to persuade the others to give aid. We can not excuse our lack of aid by the fact that Japan's own personal income is small. We must not mix "assistance" and "business." Like other countries, we must differentiate clearly between aid, and trade connected with this aid. Besides, aid does not always mean monetary gifts. There must be plans to use the money efficiently, accompanied by direct technological assistance.

The most important thing is to incorporate our ideas of aid into our foreign policy. Japan is not going to develop nuclear weapons; she has no wish to build up her military forces or become involved in the center of world politics. We must avoid these things and discover a way to contribute to international, peaceful prosperity. The "Asia-Pacific Plan" must not be considered merely as another version of the struggle against Communism. We must not categorize nations into those who "rule" and those who "are ruled."

The East: Every aspect of your "Asia-Pacific Plan" now seems clear. You conceive of a long-range plan to establish a cooperative economic organization among the advanced countries facing the Pacific Ocean. Turning now to domestic problems, do you think that the setup of political parties in Japan reflects a delicate balance between East and West?

Mr. MIKI. In Japan, there are 5 major political parties: the Liberal-Democrat Party which holds $\frac{2}{3}$ of all seats in the Diet; the official opposition, the Japan Socialist Party; and the lesser Democratic-Socialist, Komelito (Clean Government) and Communist parties which have only a few seats. The great policy differences between the Liberal-Democrats and the Socialists leave no room for compromise. In defense, for instance, the Liberal-Democrats are in favor of a Self-Defense Force, while the Socialists advocate complete demilitarization and are avidly opposed to the Japan-United States Security Treaty.

The "above-party" politics practiced in most countries is not possible in Japan at

present. The advantages of a constructive opposition and frequent changes of government are also missing here. The Liberal-Democratic Party has been ruling for so long that certain troubles come up merely because of complacency. I do not feel that party politics in Japan are very healthy at present.

Japan's economy has developed so rapidly since the end of the war that it is no longer possible for a single party to rule solely for the benefit of its members or a certain social class. In the Japan Socialist Party there is a tendency to realize the necessity of reform, and there is a modernization group even in the Liberal-Democratic Party. There are healthy signs; yet, it is still very difficult to prepare a common ground between the ruling party and the opposition—we still have a long way to go.

DR. WILLARD E. EDWARDS' PERPETUAL CALENDAR DESERVES SERIOUS AND FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill providing for the adoption, as of January 1, 1973, of the perpetual calendar devised by Dr. Willard E. Edwards, of Honolulu. Lest it be considered a crackpot of an idea, I have given the proposed calendar and its creator my very serious study.

Dr. Edwards has devoted many years to research in calendar reform. Born in Chatham, Mass., in 1903, he attended the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Oklahoma where he received his degree in engineering.

He was called into the service of the Navy during World War II and attained the rank of lieutenant commander. He has had extensive aeronautical and electronics experience and is a retired electrical and corrosion-control engineer.

A man with a mission, Dr. Edwards on weekends and vacations, has for 45 years pursued the enormous undertaking of acquainting the world with his proposal for a new international standard civil calendar and of asking for its adoption.

This has been his hobby ever since 1922 when he first published "The Perpetual Calendar." Since then he has written and lectured on his plan in over 300 cities in 90 countries outside the United States on six trips around the world. His aim is to replace the irregularities of the present variable calendar with a fixed calendar of 12 months and four equal quarters.

As a schoolboy in Quincy, Mass., he learned that the present civil calendar is due to changes made by two Roman emperors, Julius and Augustus Caesar each had a month named after themselves. The fifth and sixth months of the Roman calendar, Quintilis and Sextilis, were renamed July and August.

One of these months had only 30 days, and Romans considered even-numbered

months unlucky. In order to make both of them "lucky number," or 31-day months, it is said that 1 day was taken from February. This month used to have 29 days, and it was then the 12th month of the year.

Dr. Edwards says that continuing the use of a 28-day month is very costly. Excepting holidays, February has 24 working days plus Sundays, in ordinary years. Yet January and March, the months preceding and following it, may have 27 working days plus Sundays. When these 2 months are compared with February, we find a difference of three twenty-fourths of 12½ percent more in the number of workdays.

Workers paid by the hour earn considerably less in February but may have the same monthly bills to pay. Employers paying their people a fixed monthly salary get less work from them in February. This short month is thus unfair to many people. It is confusing in all statistical, accounting, and comparison work.

Also, in ordinary years, the first 3 months have 90 days, the second quarter has 91, and the third and fourth have 92 days each. In addition to these various unequal divisions in the present calendar, the other main fault is its lack of fixity. Each year starts on a different day of the week, and no two years are alike in succession. There is actually no such thing as a comparable period last year in our present calendar system.

To correct these two serious faults of unequal division and lack of fixity, Dr. Edwards freely offers his calendar proposal for international adoption. It is known worldwide as the perpetual calendar. The first day of this proposal will become a day apart; an international holiday preceding January 1, to be known simply as New Year's Day. Without this revision, any other proposed calendar change becomes impractical. New Year's Day need not have a number, except that bankers and accountants would call it "January zero" or plain New Year's Day for necessary accounting purposes.

Others may call it a "second Sunday," since it follows Sunday, December 31, and precedes Monday, January 1. We may now have a "second Sunday"—or any other day of the week—when crossing the 180th meridian traveling eastward. Such a calendar correction is made for the sake of civil uniformity in time-keeping. It has been accepted by intelligent people at the international date line ever since its adoption in 1884. This was our last calendar correction.

Zero, by the way, is a perfectly good cardinal number. The prime meridian of longitude through Greenwich is "the zero meridian," and the first hour of each day is "the zero hour." We don't say it is 1 o'clock or 01:00 until 1 hour past midnight, the beginning of the second hour of the day.

In the perpetual calendar, January 1 becomes the second day of the new year. It will always be Monday, the first day of the week. Dr. Edwards says it will be a business day in his proposal, as shown herein. The preceding day is New Year's Day, and it may be abbreviated as NYD.

In leap years, a second "day apart" in

the middle of the year is called "leap-year day." It may be abbreviated as LYD, and it would be called "July zero" for necessary accounting purposes. These 2 "year days" will be the third days of 3-day weekends, since they follow a Saturday and Sunday and precede a Monday. Their only purpose is to make the civil calendar fixed and perpetual.

With New Year's Day as a day apart, the remaining 364 days in ordinary years are readily divisible into 52 complete weeks. Each 3 months will then have exactly 91 days—13 weeks—the months being arranged in a 30-, 30-, 31-day sequence. This allows each month in the year to have 26 workdays, plus rest days or sabbaths.

The last day of each quarter, a Sunday, can be efficiently used for accounting purposes. Each quarter's bookkeeping and tax figuring may then be completed within that quarter. Accountants will be paid overtime for that day, and they will not be interfered with by the usual weekday customer work.

Dr. Edwards also suggests that we print Sunday at the end of the week on our present calendars. It is printed that way now in most European countries. Saturday and Sunday are "the weekend," and Monday is commonly used as the first day of the week. This may also be noted on the printed timetables of international airlines.

The perpetual calendar is a scientific plan to correct the two costly faults of our present calendar, unequal divisions and lack of fixity. Its approval by this body will hasten the date of its adoption. Its civil use will actually save hundreds of thousands of hours and dollars now lost annually through needless accounting and calculation caused by existing calendar irregularities.

Legislatures of two States of our Union, Hawaii and Massachusetts, have officially endorsed the perpetual calendar. It has also been approved by many chambers of commerce, heads of governments, and large companies. College presidents, editors, and thousands of others interested in world progress and efficiency have also endorsed it. But Dr. Edwards is still looking for sponsors to actively carry on current promotional work and to help multiply his efforts all over the world.

He says no progress is ever made without change. He would be proud to see the government of any nation take an interest in his calendar plan. If any one nation adopted the perpetual calendar, he believes other countries would soon follow. The international metric system of weights and measures, for example, is gradually being adopted by one nation after another. Also, right-hand highway driving, and the dollar system of currency, are slowly being adopted internationally.

Dr. Edwards says there are now more people in the world—Buddhists, Hindus, Mohammedans, and so forth—using other calendars than there are those using the Gregorian calendar. There are at least 15 different calendars in use in India, three in Thailand, and five in the one city of Jerusalem. The late distinguished Prime Minister of India, Mr.

Nehru, once remarked that he would be very happy to see just one international civil calendar in use, like one international civil clock.

The perpetual calendar is proposed only as a fixed civil calendar, to be used internationally for business, educational, and social purposes. Religious calendars can continue to be used along with it, just as they are now used. We have a 24-hour clock in international civil time-keeping; why not one fixed international civil calendar? The clock and the calendar simply record the passing of time; in seconds, minutes, hours, days, weeks, months, quarters, and years.

It is easy to calculate your birthday anniversary under the new calendar. Simply count the number of days in the present calendar from the beginning of the year to your birthdate. Then count the same number of yeardays in the perpetual calendar starting with "New Year's Day." Thus, a person born on January 31 under the old calendar could celebrate his birthdate on January 30 in the new calendar.

Persons born on May 31 could observe May 29, and those born on July 31 could use July 29. There will never be more than 2 days difference between the two calendars. Those born on August 31 could celebrate on August 30, and those born on October 31 would find October 30 to be the same yearday. No one would need to lose a birthday anniversary, but many would gain one. Those born on February 29 in leap years would be able to observe that same date every year in the perpetual calendar.

Easter is proposed on April 14 to conform with the original historic date and a provisional bill of the British Parliament enacted in 1928. The bill asked for observance of Easter on the first Sunday after the second Saturday in April. Good Friday will never then fall on Friday the 13th, there being no such day in the perpetual calendar. In this plan there will be more 3-day weekend holidays falling on their actual dates than in any other calendar. They are: New Year's Day, NYD; President's Day, February 13; Easter Monday, April 15; Labor Day, September 4; Columbus Day, October 12; and Christmas Day, December 25. Other holidays may also be changed to Monday or Friday, if so legislated. Current bills to do this are now pending in Congress and in State legislatures.

The perpetual calendar will permit everyone to celebrate his birthday, wedding anniversary, and all holidays on the same day of the week each year. This will make it easy to remember anniversaries. To replace the present calendar jingle of "30 days hath September, April, June, and November, and so forth," Dr. Edwards offers the following:

With a day apart, the year's begun,
Followed by thirty, thirty, thirty-one
Months always start a certain way,
On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.
Each quarter and each year the same,
Is the perpetual calendar's aim.

Mr. Speaker, the perpetual calendar is truly deserving of our serious and favorable consideration. Under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR

[New Year's Day (a day apart from any week or month) is the first day of each year, a holiday between Dec. 31 and Jan. 1. It is followed by the 364-day fixed calendar shown below]

January							February							March						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	4	5	6	7	1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
29	30						27	28	29	30										

April							May							June						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	4	5	6	7	1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
29	30						27	28	29	30										

July							August							September						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4	5	6	7	1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
29	30						27	28	29	30										

October							November							December						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	4	5	6	7	1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
29	30						27	28	29	30										

[Leap-Year Day (a second day apart) is observed only during leap years between June 31 and July 1 as the first day of the second half-year, a holiday]¹

¹ These 2 Year-Days are definitely named and have a definite purpose. When considered apart from any week, they allow the calendar to become fixed and perpetual.

OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR NATION'S YOUTH

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much written lately about our Nation's youth that I imagine each of us considers himself singularly well informed on their activities, beliefs, likes, and dislikes. But there is a small proportion of our young people about whom very little is written. Their activities more often than not end them up in jail. Their beliefs are often uncommunicable to the reading public—or unprintable. These are the 7 million young people between the ages of 16 and 21 that have dropped out of school, a large percentage of whom have not been able to find employment. These are the four dropouts out of every 10 that are living at home with families that pull in less than \$3,000 annual income. These are the 1 million youngsters who are trying to find jobs, equipped with only an elementary education—or less.

Because their stories are often not

happy ones, because their future often looks bleak, our society has in the past more or less ignored them and left them to fend for themselves as best they can. In the meantime, the juvenile delinquency rate skyrockets. Youth loses out. And so do we.

The Johnson administration and the Congress are trying to change all this. First by calling attention to the cracks in our affluent society into which some of our youth are being drawn. Chasms of poverty, despair, and violence. But the administration has not stopped with drawing attention to the needs of our youth. In recent years, it has made a concentrated effort to remedy the most serious problems that face many of our youngsters by introducing legislation in the areas of juvenile delinquency, youth employment, and education. This has been opportunity-creating legislation which authorizes hope, not handouts. Its real purpose has been to make responsible, independent citizens of those of our young people who have gotten the short end of the stick in the past: through inadequate educational facilities, through lack of opportunity to learn a trade, through insufficient exposure to the material and moral environments that our more fortunate children have been enjoying all their lives.

Perhaps the greatest progress has been

made in education. If the word had not been used to death in recent times, I think it would be proper to call the change in attitude and opportunity in the last few years an educational revolution. The Johnson administration and the 89th Congress were the first to insist that education must be a national concern, that our country as a whole cannot continue to make progress unless all of its people are able to obtain the kind of education that will enable them to take their places as responsible citizens, able to pay their own way and conscious of their social obligations. People are not born responsible citizens. In the past, we have been lucky in that the majority of homes, schools, and other institutions have been able, by a hit-or-miss process, to give most of our Nation's youth the background and education which it takes to turn them into responsible citizens. But there has always been a minority who were scarcely touched by all our good efforts and in the past decade this minority has been growing. We now know, I think, the potential for destruction that this group, outside the mainstream of American life, carries within it. And we are trying to do a number of things that will reintegrate them into society.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is the first law in our Nation's history to mobilize the resources

of the Federal Government to help all of our States and communities meet the educational needs of our schoolchildren. It is a unique piece of legislation in another way also. For the first time, we have an Education Act that is oriented toward the needs of people, of children. Under this act, Federal grants have been made to aid in the purchase of educational equipment and textbooks, in the establishment of communitywide educational centers, and for setting up research programs which will study the needs of our children not merely the managerial needs of institutions they attend. In all, at least 69 million children throughout the country are already educationally richer due to Elementary and Secondary Act programs.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 provides similar grants to colleges and universities so that they can expand and provide a better education for a greater number of students. Grants for needy students were also made available and the National Teacher Corps was created to provide trained teachers for the Nation's urban and rural slums.

One of the most exciting programs for youth was announced by Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in 1965. This is Upward Bound, a precollege program for secondary school students, involving a full-time summer program and followup sessions during the regular school year. Upward Bound seeks to rescue the youngster whose brains and ability may be lost to society, or worse yet, be directed against society unless he can be motivated to apply his talents and energies constructively. The program aims to turn these youngsters around; and, in the process, it may turn around some thinking about education.

Out of a total of 2,061 students enrolled in the first experimental Upward Bound programs in the summer of 1965, 1,994 are now on their way out of poverty through education. The turnaround of these students from an attitude of apathy or hostility to an eagerness for learning and a new sense of responsibility for their own destiny has been remarkable. Just as Headstart, which prepares disadvantaged children for successful performances in primary school, Upward Bound had its share of critics and scoffers when the program was first begun. But both programs have been such successes that their opponents have had to eat their words. They are fulfilling a genuine need of our youth.

Other administration legislation has eased college housing loan interest rates, extended social security benefits to schoolchildren and provided them with a variety of health services. Federally insured loans for vocational technical and business schools have been made available under the Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act.

The Johnson administration has also taken the lead in expanding job opportunities for youth. The Job Corps, part of the President's war on poverty, will eventually enlist 100,000 young men and women whose background, health, or education handicap their efforts to find useful work. At Job Corps centers, the

enrollees participate in programs of basic education, development of responsible citizenship attitudes, skill training, and constructive work experience for an average of 9 months. After graduation, corpsmen are assisted in finding jobs, returning to school, or entering the Armed Forces. Forty-five thousand young people—at least 23 percent of whom were women—had been enrolled by the end of fiscal year 1967.

Other Economic Opportunity Act programs run by the Department of Labor provide work-training for young people from low-income families to assist them to stay in school, return to school, or to increase their employability. Youth also benefits from provisions of the Manpower Development and Retraining Act of 1962, which provides for training programs in major cities for people who might otherwise be out of work and unlikely to get work. Training has been authorized for more than 600,000 individuals under this act. About 75 percent of the graduates of MDTA projects have been placed in jobs and are now contributing members of society.

The list of bills and acts and programs is long and impressive. Nothing, however, shows Executive concern over youth more clearly than Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY's enthusiastic and successful chairmanship of the Youth Opportunity Campaign which has provided over 1 million summer jobs for American youths in each of the last two summers. This is the sort of leadership that can lick problems. I think all of us have been proud to see it displayed so strongly in the hitherto neglected area of helping out our disadvantaged youth.

Steps forward in the areas of employment and education mean progress in curing some of the social ills on which juvenile delinquency thrives. The Federal Government is also an active partner with States and communities in developing programs for the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. The Juvenile Delinquency Control Act, which has been in effect since 1961, provides grants for experimental demonstration and training projects in urban areas throughout the United States. The administration, through its support of this legislation, has again signified its concern with problems besetting our young people.

But what about the majority of our Nation's youth, the ones we do read about, who come from homes where their material welfare is taken care of by dotting parents. To think about Government aid in connection with these youngsters seems ludicrous. But in one area at least, parents do not think it is funny at all. During the next year, the Nation's education bill will set a record—more than \$52 billion. Parents will tell you that costs for higher education are skyrocketing for the 6½ million students who are enrolling in colleges and universities this fall. Here again, we are helping to fulfill a real need. The guaranteed student loan program which falls under the Higher Education Act is intended primarily to help students from middle-income families meet the rising costs of college by enabling them to procure loans underwritten by the State, the interest of

which is paid by the Federal Government during study years. Almost 1 million students will be reaping the benefits of this program during the ongoing school year.

But perhaps in the long run, our greatest contribution to many of our materially well-off youth is an intangible one which has, however, had perceptible effects on their attitudes and actions. In extreme contrast to the noninvolvement of our young people in the fifties, the sixties have seen a tremendous change in their feelings about their roles in the community, in the Nation, and as members of a world community. It is hard to put your finger on this change, but parents of young people, I believe, will understand what I am talking about. The events of 1962 in a number of ways ushered in a new era in our history. Not the least important "happening" was the creation of the Peace Corps. Few proposals in government aroused as much skepticism as the Peace Corps and few proposals have had such dramatic success. Far too many people in this country were quite convinced that our young people were not capable of handling their own problems, much less taking on those of others. They did not understand that a program like the Peace Corps was what thousands of youngsters were looking for, that it provided an outlet for their idealism and an opportunity to help individual people who were in dire need of personal attention. The little group of 35 volunteers which were sent to Tanzania in 1962 has expanded until today there are almost 15,000 volunteers in the field; 13,000 have returned and are sharing their valuable experiences with the rest of us. How many of their older brothers and sisters, how many of their parents for that matter, have shared in their excitement and wished that such an opportunity had been available to them when they were that age.

In the last few years, young people have realized that they need not go abroad to be of service to their fellow man. That there are plenty of people closer to home who desperately need a dose of their idealism and willingness to give of themselves. President Johnson understands, perhaps, better than many of us this need of youth to be of service and he has done a very obvious thing: he has paired up the needs of our country with its greatest untapped resource—its youth. It is surprising that this was not done before—but it was not. Perhaps some of our current domestic difficulties stem from the fact that it was not.

Young people have responded in a wonderful way to the opportunities for service at home which were created by legislation passed by the 89th Congress. Volunteers in Service to America, which was established under the Economic Opportunity Act, has recruited the vast majority of its volunteers from the ranks of youth. Today there are over 3,500 full-time VISTA volunteers in the field, working in the slums, on our Indian reservations, and among our migrant workers. Another 2,000 volunteers worked during the summer. The Teacher Corps, which was authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965 and has been struggling for its existence ever since, at-

tracted over 2,000 applicants in 1967, even though its very future was in doubt.

To be sure, all young people interested in service have not flocked to jobs initiated by the Federal Government. But the Government has taken the lead in providing opportunities for youth to serve and this example has stimulated State and local governments and private organizations to do the same. Every large city is recruiting young people as volunteers now for community action work; even smaller communities and rural areas are finding their services of value.

It is not surprising that young people, participating in service projects almost as a matter of course while growing up, are becoming increasingly attracted to a career in social service, and this, for many of them, includes Government service. Some years ago, government work at any level was the last thing that interested a bright, idealistic young person but this is not true any more. We are starting to get an impressive number of capable young people dedicated to public service choosing a career in Government. This is reflected in the tremendous expansion here in Washington of summer intern programs which give students an opportunity to work in Government agencies or on Capitol Hill during their vacations. Last summer, for example, we had around 7,000 interns working on Capitol Hill in congressional offices and for committees; this number is more than double what it was in 1966 when the program was first expanded, partially because of the impetus provided by a law passed by the 89th Congress giving Congressmen extra appropriations to hire summer help.

Our young people are a valuable national resource; their intelligence, energy, and dedication are finally being tapped, a process which can only strengthen our government and improve the welfare of the people which it serves.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would protect the constitutional rights and privacy of Federal employees.

Violations of Government employee privacy have been the subject of hearings and investigations by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights during the past five Congresses. Each section of this bill is based on hundreds of employee complaints. Every major employee organization and union, and many of this country's law professors urge enactment of this legislation.

Why should the 3 million employees of the Federal Government not enjoy the same privacy as their fellow citizens who

work for private employers? The fear, suspicion, and resentment generated by a "Big Brother" type of regimentation drive many competent professionals to quit in disgust, while others develop a "do not rock the boat" attitude which stifles initiative and imagination.

Despite congressional representations and negotiations with the executive branch, the Civil Service Commission has not acted effectively to institute general remedial measures. Congress must therefore establish a statutory basis for the protection of employee rights. This legislation would not only attract and retain qualified employees, but would serve as a model for the personnel procedures of State and local government and private industry.

Case after case of intimidation—including threats of loss of job, promotion, or security clearance—have come to the attention of Congress in connection with bond sales and Government charity drives. Federal employees have complained of required attendance during their leisure time at outside activities totally unrelated to job performance or skills. Government employees have had to answer insulting—even obscene—questions about their sexual behavior, and attitudes toward family and religion. Others have had to fill out unnecessary, detailed financial statements listing their own assets and those of their family—everything from cash in the bank to Christmas presents.

The bill I have introduced outlaws these abuses of personal privacy. It also sets up an independent, three-man Board on Employees' Rights. The Board would receive complaints from individuals or unions, hold hearings, and make rulings on violations. If the Board determined that a violation of the act had been committed or threatened, it could issue cease and desist orders against the offending employee, and work to eliminate unlawful practices by conciliation and persuasion. In the case of a first offense, the Board might also issue an official reprimand, or order suspension without pay of the offending employee for up to 15 days. In the case of a second or subsequent offense, the Board might order suspension without pay for up to 30 days, or order the employee's removal from office. Either the complaining employee or the Government could appeal the Board's decision in Federal district court. Redress of a violation could also be sought directly from a Federal district court.

Only through the establishment of this Board can Federal employees be assured effective recourse against personnel practices which violate their rights. Placing authority for remedial action within the Civil Service system is not the key to effective action. Prof. Alan F. Westin, professor of public law at Columbia University, has said:

The theory of our Government is that there should be somewhere within the executive branch where this kind of malpractice is corrected and that good administration ought to provide for control of supervision or other practices that are not proper. But the sheer size of the Federal Establishment, the ambiguity of the relationship of the Civil Service Commission to employees, and the many different interests

that the Civil Service Commission has to bear in its role in the Federal Government, suggest that it is not an effective instrument for this kind of complaint procedure.

The House should hold hearings and take action on this bill as soon as it is passed by the Senate. The evidence is in; the need for legislation is indisputable. Additional delay is unnecessary.

COMMODORE JOHN BARRY DAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Commodore John Barry Day.

John Barry came to America from Ireland in 1759. His brilliant naval career began during our War for Independence; he was the first regularly commissioned American officer to capture an enemy ship, he was the first senior captain in the American Navy, and he fought in both the first and last naval engagements of the war. One cannot study our War for Independence without realizing the significant role he played, and it is for this reason that John Barry is often considered to be the father of the American Navy.

He continued his brilliant naval career after the Revolutionary War, and saw action against the pirates of Algiers. At the time of his retirement he was a commodore in the Navy.

The American people today can look back on this era of our history and be proud that John Barry made his home on our shores. His contributions to the establishment and growth of our Republic are considerable. Although the joint resolution I have introduced to authorize the President to proclaim Commodore John Barry Day has not been considered in this Congress, I urge my colleagues and all Americans to join with me in honoring Commodore John Barry.

The joint resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 84

Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 13th day of September as Commodore John Barry Day

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the 13th day of September of each year as Commodore John Barry Day in commemoration of the life and service of Commodore John Barry, father of the American Navy, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

STATEMENT OF AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the executive council of the AFL-CIO yesterday issued a statement supporting the courageous efforts of my colleague from New York [Mr. RESNICK] to uncover the facts with regard to the nature and activities of the Farm Bureau Federation.

I commend this statement to the attention of my colleagues and the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
ON AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

America's working farmers along with their fellow nonfarm workers have been the consistent target of the ultraconservative, big business-oriented American Farm Bureau Federation.

Operators of small and medium sized farms have been financially maimed by the Farm Bureau's campaign for smaller Federal farm subsidies. Oil interests, simultaneously, have cheered the Farm Bureau in its lobbying efforts toward maintaining and increasing the oil depletion allowance, a major tax loophole that costs Americans billions of dollars a year.

Many farmers fight for survival against the poverty plague sweeping the rural areas. The Farm Bureau stands tall in the ranks of the enemies of the struggling farmer by opposing with their vast resources all rural area development and anti-poverty programs.

Elderly Americans have been victimized by the determined effort of the Farm Bureau to weaken, if it cannot kill, Federal and State Medicare legislation. Americans young and old can find the Farm Bureau actively opposing improved Social Security benefits.

Farm Bureau leadership has fought the application of any minimum wage to farm workers. The battle by farm workers to receive the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, as accorded millions of non-farm workers, finds the Farm Bureau aligned in solid opposition.

Right to Work legislation is actively pursued by the Farm Bureau leadership as a part of its campaign to destroy trade unionism. The Farm Bureau would further damage organized labor by prohibiting industry-wide collective bargaining, by stopping unions from attempting to save the jobs of men and women replaced by machines, by shackling unions with anti-trust laws.

Farm Bureau policy calls for the recruitment of farm laborers from Mexico and other foreign lands for exploitation by large farm operators in America.

The Farm Bureau is a haven for right wing extremists, providing them platforms and pay for speeches and distributing literature which attacks with venom the institutions that are the foundation of democracy and freedom.

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations now takes note of the courageous attempt by Congressman Joseph Y. Resnick of New York to unvell the tainted business and lobbying activities of the Farm Bureau. Though opposed by the House Agriculture Committee of which he is a member Congressman Resnick, alone with his own funds, has revealed startling new information about the operations of the Farm Bureau. In conducting hearings as a one-man ad hoc committee, the Congressman contends that:

1. The Farm Bureau's membership make-up violates the tax-exempt status given the organization since nearly half of its purported membership of 1,600,000 are not farmers.

2. The Farm Bureau operates a massive insurance trust that encompasses more than

fifty companies with interlocking directorships of Farm Bureau officials. These companies have in force more than ten billion dollars worth of insurance. The Farm Bureau uses membership as a device for selling insurance.

3. The Farm Bureau buys and sells human labor through the operation of at least five migrant labor camps, locking employees into a condition of abject poverty and filth.

4. United States Government buildings are used to headquarter Farm Bureau operations, including insurance sales offices, giving the impression that the Farm Bureau has the endorsement of the Federal Government.

5. Though a tax-exempt organization, the Farm Bureau is engaged in oil, chemical and fertilizer businesses, as well as operating multi-million dollar shopping centers and other retail outlets. Farmers are frequently squeezed by these endeavors, being forced to sell to and buy from the Farm Bureau enterprises.

6. The Farm Bureau manipulates the editorial policies of rural newspapers through the pressures that can be applied with its heavy advertising disbursements.

7. The Farm Bureau has issued "patronage dividends" to customers of its cooperatives which under no circumstances are convertible to cash and which cannot be used as credits against purchases—which are, in fact, worthless.

8. The Farm Bureau has subverted many rural youth organizations, including the Federally supported 4-H Clubs and Future Farmers of America, by indoctrinating them with right wing extremist propaganda.

9. The Farm Bureau wields an iron fist over its subdivisions, punishing those who disagree with Farm Bureau policy.

10. The Farm Bureau in many areas dominates the Agricultural Extension Service, a Federal agency, by maintaining such an intertwined relationship that many are led to believe the Extension Service is a Farm Bureau agency.

We, the members of the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO, support Congressman Resnick in his endeavors to get the Farm Bureau to make public the true nature of that organization.

We further call upon the House Agriculture Committee to work with, rather than hamper, Congressman Resnick in his attempt to find the truth about all farm organizations.

Further, we call upon the appropriate agencies of the United States Government to investigate in depth the Farm Bureau's tax-exempt status, its lobbying activities, its use of United States property and personnel to advance its fortunes and its ultra-right wing philosophies.

POVERTY AIDES HERE NOT INCITING UNREST, TATE SAYS IN LETTER

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Mayor James Tate of Philadelphia has replied very forcefully to those who are of the mistaken belief that antipoverty workers may have been involved in urban unrest. A recent edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer has reported the mayor's statement which

credited Philadelphia's antipoverty workers with promoting understanding among Philadelphians of all races. Specifically, Mayor Tate said:

With regard to the anti-poverty program, let me assure you that I have no reason to believe that any workers in this program in Philadelphia were in any way involved in instigating, stimulating or abetting the disorders which have occurred in the community.

Mayor Tate went on to point out that Philadelphia did not have any major disturbances this summer. In this connection he said:

It is my belief that the efforts of the anti-poverty program, together with programs conducted by other city agencies, have had much to do with the peace that has prevailed.

The article above mentioned follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Sept. 2, 1967]

POVERTY AIDES HERE NOT INCITING UNREST, TATE SAYS IN LETTER

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 1.—Mayor James H. J. Tate has defended Philadelphia's antipoverty program in a letter to a Texas Congressman, declaring that, to his knowledge, none of the workers in the program was fomenting racial disorders.

On the contrary, Tate, in the letter made public Friday, credited the city's antipoverty workers with promoting understanding among Philadelphians of all races.

TWENTY-FOUR MAYORS QUERIED

Tate was one of 24 mayors from across the country responding to a letter from Rep. Bob Casey (D., Tex.), who earlier this month inquired as to whether poverty workers on the payroll of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity were behind the recent city rioting.

Casey also asked the mayors whether present Federal standards for urban assistance were too rigid to meet the needs of their cities.

On the question of involvement of OEO personnel in the riots, Casey said only two mayors complained of questionable behavior.

TATE'S COMMENTS

He reported that 18 others said the OEO employees were not involved and that "many commented favorably on the tremendous work done by these employees in preventing violence."

Tate had this to say on the subject:

"With regard to the antipoverty program, let me assure you that I have no reason to believe that any workers in this program in Philadelphia were in any way involved in instigating, stimulating or abetting the disorders which have occurred in the community.

"We have not, of course, had any major disturbances this summer, and it is my belief that the efforts of the antipoverty program, together with programs conducted by other city agencies, have had much to do with the peace that has prevailed."

MEAT INSPECTION: THE NEW JUNGLE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ardent followers of the hearings concerning meat inspection and one of the most enterprising reporters in digging out the facts concerning the need for amendments to meat inspection laws has been Nick Kotz, a correspondent for the Des Moines Register and Minneapolis Tribune. An article by him is now appearing in the September 18 issue of *The Nation*.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the article and I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all who are interested in it will have an opportunity to read it.

This article specifically points out something that people should know and that is that to be sure, a buyer should look for the Federal meat inspection seal.

It is as follows:

MEAT INSPECTION: THE NEW JUNGLE
(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON.—Does the American citizen have an inherent right to safe, government-inspected meat, even when traveling through a state that does not provide meat inspection? Aled P. Davies, genial and skilled chief lobbyist for the American Meat Institute, nonchalantly denies it.

When Rep. Thomas Foley (D., Wash.) peppered him in mid-July with questions about how the traveler can be assured the hamburger he buys is made of safe, federally inspected meat, Davies replied casually that he might variously demand federally inspected meat, ask to see the meat package, determine the meat's condition by smelling it, or—if he is really nervous—carry his own meat with him.

Lounging easily in the witness chair before a House Agriculture Livestock Subcommittee, which usually follows the advice of his industry, Davies said he was not nervous. He expressed complete confidence in the wholesomeness of American meat, whether federally inspected, state inspected, or not inspected at all.

The hearing was called to consider legislation to modernize a 1906 federal meat inspection law which has not been significantly changed since Upton Sinclair provoked it with *The Jungle*, which deals inadequately with conditions in a fast-changing meat industry and which leaves 15 per cent of American meat slaughtering and 25 per cent of meat processing exempt from federal inspection. But since the sessions were sparsely attended and largely ignored by the press, the vast majority of Americans were not privy to Davies' view that visitors to a state are no more entitled to special meat protection than to special hunting laws. State laws differ on many issues, he said.

Meat produced for interstate commerce must be federally inspected, but 8.7 billion pounds (enough to feed 30 million people) are sold annually intrastate without federal inspection. It is doubtful that many consumers know that only twenty-five states require inspection of both slaughtering and processing and that even these states usually have insufficient trained personnel to enforce their laws.

Congressman Foley, a subcommittee member, is aware of these facts and their unappetizing significance. The 38-year-old sophomore Representative perked up when Davies said of state inspection systems: "We believe that generally speaking they have provided the kind of consumer protection that the people living in those states have thought necessary and have been willing to pay for."

Foley, who is urging that federal inspection be extended to cover virtually all meat sold

in the United States, does not for a minute share Davies' confidence in the public satisfaction. He believes that most housewives feel secure at the market only because they falsely assume that all meat has undergone rigid federal inspection.

Davies is vice president of the American Meat Institute, which represents the largest meat packers. The hostility he expressed toward the need for any new legislation was echoed by representatives of the Independent Meat Packers Association, Western Meat Packers Association, the National Renderers Association, and the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA).

One week later, however, most of the major trade associations and NASDA had altered drastically their position and switched their lobbying tactics. Suddenly, most of the meat lobbyists openly or privately began to back a Johnson Administration bill that would strengthen federal enforcement and would provide up to 50 per cent of federal funds to states willing to approximate federal inspection standards. The bill, however, would not expand federal inspection to any more plants.

The meat industry and NASDA now want the bill approved quickly and quietly, their new objective being to head off tougher legislation proposed by Foley and Rep. Neal Smith (D., Ia.). Foley and Smith propose not only to close loopholes in the present law but to bring large intrastate packers under federal inspection, so that 97 per cent of the nation's meat supply would be federally inspected.

The two Congressmen can see no legal logic to limiting federal meat inspection by a 1906 interpretation which restricts the term "interstate commerce" to actual sales across state lines, since most federal laws regulating industry have long assumed jurisdiction over firms having sufficient volume of business "to affect interstate commerce." The federal minimum wage law applies to businesses grossing \$250,000 or more a year, and that is the figure the sponsors of the new bill adopt.

The worst fears of NASDA and the meat industry in the last five years have suddenly become a reality. A few newspapers and consumer critic Ralph Nader have begun to reveal the stomach-turning details of a Department of Agriculture investigation showing conditions in non-federally inspected plants throughout the country. The survey, made in 1962, revealed unbelievably foul sanitary conditions, the use of diseased animals, adulteration of meat products, and labeling practices which mislead consumers as to the contents of luncheon meats, wieners and sausage. It also showed most state and local inspection systems to be completely inadequate, either because of limited laws, insufficient appropriations, unskilled inspectors or lax enforcement.

The report was never released or legislation pushed because the department was transfixed in a Hamlet-like conflict between its responsibility to consumers and its responsibility to promote meat sales. But now the unsavory details are getting about, and the meat industry and cooperative Congressmen want the Administration bill adopted quickly before public alarm and disgust provide pressure for the Smith-Foley bill.

Following a cozy private conference between the industry and leaders of the Agriculture committee, the subcommittee and full committee have quickly approved the Administration bill. The Smith-Foley substitute plan was defeated by overwhelming votes in both the subcommittee and full committee. The committee does not plan to print the report of the 1962 USDA investigation or of a new survey made in July of this year, a survey that confirms the 1962 findings of filth, adulteration, deceptive labeling and farcical state inspection. Most

committee members agreed that the USDA studies should be withheld in order to protect the legitimate industry.

But Smith and Foley, joined by a small but growing band of new supporters, are now armed with the reports and are unafraid to use them as they carry their fight to the House floor. Furthermore, Sen. Walter Mondale (D., Minn.), shocked by news accounts of abuses, is now pushing an even stronger bill in the Senate. Adopting concepts from the Administration's earlier 1965 bill, Mondale would make all meat subject to federal inspection but would permit states to inspect intrastate meat when the Secretary of Agriculture finds that they have established adequate systems to guarantee federal standards.

The Administration backed away from the 1965 bill only because NASDA and the meat industry had successfully blocked the legislation from even receiving a hearing in the 89th Congress. Now Smith has asked President Johnson to reassert the Administration's support for stronger legislation.

The most recent USDA survey is not pleasant reading, but it makes vivid the conditions which the proposed legislation is designed to correct. Least surprising were reports from the eight states (Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, New Hampshire and South Dakota) which provide no state inspection. Among the conditions reported by experienced USDA meat inspectors:

At a New Hampshire plant: "All rooms were dirty, caked with blood, grease and filth. Men with dirty clothing were boning dirty meat on dirty tables."

At a Colorado plant: "The band saw had not been cleaned for several days and the bone dust in the bottom of the saw was filled with maggots. I noticed rat droppings and tracks on boxes and wrapping paper in sawdust on the floor."

At an Alabama plant: "The cooler contained a dressed hog with a sore on the side which had not been trimmed and several hogs with excess hair."

The federal inspectors found similar conditions at plants in many of the thirteen states which provide voluntary meat inspection; that is, meat packers may have state inspection if they request it. These states are Arizona, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Texas.

At a Pennsylvania plant: "Ninety per cent of beef quarters showed evidence of bruises, sores, etc. General sanitation of the entire establishment was very poor."

At a Texas plant: "Meat drums were very dirty, contaminated with rust and the insides showed a very poor job of washing."

At an Oklahoma plant: "This company slaughters and processes a full line of sausage and smoked meat products in a building which isn't fit to be a dog food plant. Sewage water was backing up in one room. A dead mouse was lying in the corner of one cooler."

At a Nebraska plant that advertises "sausage products with that old-world taste," the inspector noted a curing vat "in which corrosion was from one-fourth to one-half inch thick."

Most disturbing, perhaps, were field notes from the twenty-five states which theoretically require inspection. Although industry officials testified that California has the best state meat inspection system, the USDA investigator noted that "canned meat product is produced without any semblance of inspection on the part of California state meat inspection." Of one canning plant in the Los Angeles area, the inspector said: "The operation is located in a building that is falling apart. It is infested with flies, cockroaches and rodents. The whole place smells bad. There is no semblance of sanitation."

Of general practices in many Wisconsin processing plants: "Ham loaf rarely includes ham; pork trimmings and veal with appropriate amounts of cereal would be more likely."

At a Florida plant: "In viewing the trimmings being dumped into the chopper chute, we noted a little trash, such as paper drinking cups, in the raw product."

At the largest non-federally inspected plant in Indiana: "The equipment was contaminated and rusty. Rack trucks used in the transportation of meat were covered with fat and heavily contaminated grease."

The 1967 report does little to support the NASDA and meat industry argument that states are rapidly improving their inspecting systems. Neither does a reading of U.S. Public Health Service statistics which show 20,040 reported cases of *salmonellosis*, an intestinal disease which can be transmitted by meat products, in 1966. Public Health Service officials say that probably only 1 per cent of instances of this disease are actually reported.

Meat industry spokesmen also contend that the inspection problem is gradually taking care of itself as an increasing number of plants come under federal inspection. The American Meat Institute stressed that the number of federally inspected plants has doubled since 1950 and that meat under federal inspection has risen by 5 per cent. But the Institute did not point out that total meat production has increased by 50 per cent during this period, and that the actual amount of non-federally inspected slaughter has actually risen from 4.2 billion pounds in 1950 to 4.9 billion in 1966.

Various opponents of expanded federal inspection have their own particular reasons for disliking it. The state agriculture department officials do not want the federal government to take over part of their domain, particularly with the clear implication that they are not doing their job. Many independent meat packers know that they would be unable to meet rigid federal requirements, especially those for plant construction. Some conservative Congressmen, state officials and meat firm executives simply are opposed in principle to any expansion of federal government into state activities.

One would suppose, however, that the giant firms would favor complete federal inspection, since more than 90 per cent of their production is already federally inspected. Yet interviews with officials of the eight largest meat packing firms reveal that only one—Oscar Mayer and Co.—favors expanded federal inspection. It is perhaps not coincidence that Mayer is one of the very few national firms which does all of its slaughtering and processing under federal inspection.

Publicly, officials of the largest firms say only that they fear Congress will not appropriate adequate funds to maintain an expanded federal system. They also express fear that dual federal standards will develop, less rigid standards being applied to smaller companies. USDA officials estimate it would cost \$30 million annually to provide expanded inspection as proposed by Foley and Smith. Smith points out that the expense amounts to less than one-tenth of a cent per pound of meat and would be a small price to pay for the safety inherent in rigid federal meat inspection.

In these inspection procedures, federal inspectors scrutinize meat continuously in the production process, beginning with inspection before slaughter, followed by examination of organs of the slaughtered animal, and continuing through whatever processing may be involved. Last year, federal inspectors examined more than 25 billion pounds of meat and condemned 250 million pounds because of disease, spoilage or adulteration.

Several witnesses before the livestock subcommittee have suggested that a more vital

concern for some of the largest firms is to avoid federal inspection of their relatively few branch processing plants which sell entirely within a state. Arnold Mayer, legislative representative for the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL-CIO), testified:

"Live cattle which obviously cannot pass inspection is sent to uninspected plants. This is done not only by the small number of get-rich-quick operators but also by some highly respectable firms. The very competitive situation in the industry currently leaves them no alternative. Their competition does it. They must do it."

An official of one of the largest firms admitted privately that his company could not compete effectively in sales of luncheon meats in several important markets if the company's branch plants had to meet federal requirements for sausage and Weiner ingredients.

The Agriculture Department has deleted the names of plants inspected in its new investigation, but the 1962 survey reported improper conditions in a number of non-federally inspected branch plants operated by several large national firms.

Swift & Co., the nation's largest packing firm, was criticized for conditions in several of its branch plants. A spokesman for Swift said that 97 per cent of the firm's slaughtering and 90 per cent of its processing is carried out under federal inspection. The company reportedly sells about 4 billion pounds of meat annually. Of the eight national firms interviewed, only Swift declined to reveal how many plants it operates without federal inspection.

Rodney Leonard, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, told the subcommittee that modern technology—in addition to providing a wide variety of better and handier meat products—has made it easier for unscrupulous operators to mask the true condition of meat. He referred to the use of high-speed equipment, the prevalence of frozen meat (which must be defrosted for effective inspection), fast curing processes, artificial smoking, coloring agents, "and other additives which are potentially deceptive and dangerous to one's health when their use is not regulated."

Leonard acknowledged that the federal inspection system is struggling to keep up with such technological innovations, and believed that few, if any, state inspection systems have sufficient competent personnel to inspect complicated, modern processing plants.

Most supporters of expanded federal inspection readily admit that even the present Administration bill would be a step in the right direction. Most important, it would give the Agriculture Department authority to keep so-called inedible meat out of human food supplies. At present, USDA has virtually no power to check on the activities of renderers, dog and cat food manufacturers, and other handlers of inedible meat that sometimes gets slipped illegally into products which are intended for human consumption.

Labor union official Mayer and other supporters of expanded federal inspection doubt, however, that state meat inspection will be greatly improved by the offer of federal funds and technical assistance. Referring to this provision in the Administration bill, Mayer said: "It would leave the situation almost the way it is now. It is an effort to buy the states into enacting meat inspection laws. But there is no requirement for the states to do so. Nor are there any real sanctions to assure that the legislation and its enforcement is effective."

The proposal of legislation has at least led to some changes in the meat buying habits of a number of secretaries on Capitol Hill. Girls in the offices of Congressmen dealing with the legislation confess they are for the

first time examining processed meat packages to make sure that they contain the federal stamp of approval. It is denoted by a circle with the wording "U.S. inspected and passed by the Department of Agriculture." Federally approved raw meat bears the purple stamp, "USDA inspected." If consumers generally would insist on the federal stamp, they might get the legislation they deserve.

U.S. ARMY AND WELFARE, RECREATION, AND MORALE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the 1967 Contemporary Military Reading List compiled by the U.S. Army for the education of our military leaders is frightening.

Recommended are the warped materials of such anti-Americans as Max Lerner without even a note or caution that the author has been cited as subversive.

A review of the reading list, Army Regulation No. 28-86, and the book reviews may awaken some to wonder if the Army is now promoting a mental revolution against constitutional government among its officer corps.

Mayhops the recommended reading list is compiled to prepare our military leaders for the establishment of the new International Peace Keeping Force under the United Nations plan recently passed by the House as a portion of the foreign aid bill.

Mr. Speaker, I here insert the Contemporary Military Reading List and reviews for each book in the Record:

[CIRCULAR No. 1-13]

Expires (1 year)

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1967.

ADMINISTRATION—1967 CONTEMPORARY MILITARY READING LIST

1. General. Department of the Army responsibilities and policies, and information on the availability of books for the Contemporary Military Reading Program are specified in AR 28-86.
2. Reading list. A brief synopsis for each book is given in the appendix.

AUTHOR, TITLE, AND YEAR

Bartlett, Ruhl, "Policy and Power: Two Centuries of American Foreign Relations," 1963.

Beaufre, Andre, "An Introduction to Strategy," 1965.

Bloomfield, Lincoln P., ed., "Outer Space: Prospects for Man and Society," 1962.

Claude, Inis L., "Power and International Relations," 1962.

*Cleveland, Harlan, "The Obligations of Power: American Diplomacy in the Search for Peace," 1966.

Clubb, O. Edmund, "Twentieth Century China," 1964.

Cross, James E., "Conflict in the Shadows: The Nature and Politics of Guerrilla War," 1963.

Deitchman, Seymour J., "Limited War and American Defense Policy," 1964.

*Books new to this list.

Fainsod, Merle, "How Russia Is Ruled" (Rev. ed.), 1963.

Fifield, Russell H., "Southeast Asia in United States Policy," 1963.

Galula, David, "Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice," 1964.

Gilpin, Robert and Wright, Christopher, ed., "Scientists and National Policy-Making," 1964.

Greenfield, Kent R., ed., "Command Decisions," 1959.

Halperin, Morton H., "China and the Bomb," 1965.

*Hitch, Charles J., "Decision-Making for Defense," 1965.

Huntington, Samuel P., "The Common Defense: Strategic Programs in National Politics," 1961.

*Jacobsen, Hans A. and Rohwer, Jurgen, "Decisive Battles of World War II: The German View," 1965.

Kaufmann, William W., "The McNamara Strategy," 1964.

*Kissinger, Henry A., ed., "Problems of National Strategy," 1965.

Kissinger, Henry A., "The Troubled Partnership," 1965.

Kulski, W. W., "International Politics in a Revolutionary Age," 1964.

Lerner, Max, "The Age of Overkill: A Preface to World Politics," 1962.

Nehemkis, Peter, "Latin America: Myth and Reality," 1964.

Osanka, Franklin M., ed., "Modern Guerrilla Warfare: Fighting Communists Guerrilla Movements, 1941-1961," 1962.

Padelford, Norman J. and Lincoln, George A., "The Dynamics of International Politics," 1962.

Pogue, Forrest C., "George C. Marshall. Vol. 1: Education of a General, 1880-1939, 1962

*Vol. 2: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942," 1966.

Quigg, Phillip W., "Africa: A Foreign Affairs Reader," 1964.

*Schwarz, Urs, "American Strategy: A New Perspective," 1966.

Warren, Sidney, "The President as World Leader," 1964.

Wolfe, Thomas W., "Soviet Strategy at the Crossroads," 1964.

APPENDIX Synopsis

"Policy and Power—Two Centuries of American Foreign Relations," by Ruhl Bartlett (1963): The history of American foreign policy, from the seeds of the Revolution through the Cuban crisis to the present, tracing the thinking of US national leaders as the nation arose out of the century of isolation into the status of a world power.

"An Introduction to Strategy," by Andre Beaufre (1965): A carefully formulated study on strategy, written by a French general, with the purpose of bringing that branch of knowledge into phase with the real world. The book relates the thought processes involved in military strategy to the political, economic, and diplomatic fields for the employment of a total strategy in which the West can achieve its aims in the global conflict.

"Outer Space: Prospects for Man and Society," edited by Lincoln P. Bloomfield (1962): Eight articles, each prepared by an authority in his field, provide an excellent analysis of the conquest of space from political, economic, social and psychological points of view; and discuss the problems that result from the impact of the space age on society. Solutions to the technical aspects of space exploration, the task of government, possible peaceful uses, problems of international co-operation, and public policy considerations are also analyzed, in a manner easily understood by the lay reader.

"Power and International Relations," by Inis L. Claude (1962): A study of the problem of the management of power in international relations; and an examination, comparison, and evaluation of the three leading

theoretical approaches to such management: the balance of power system; collective security, as an alternative; and world government, as a monopoly of power.

*"The Obligations of Power: American Diplomacy in the Search for Peace," by Harlan Cleveland (1966): Written by a former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs and the present US Ambassador to NATO, this book is an excellent review of and forecast of US policy. A short and very readable account of US successes in the cold war emphasizes lessons for crisis management, means of maintaining peace, and the usefulness of development assistance.

"Twentieth Century China," by O. Edmund Clubb (1964): A political history of China which seeks to demonstrate that present day Communist China is an evolutionary product of her past history rather than a revolutionary product of Marxism-Leninism. The parallels discovered between the policies and objectives of Mao Tse-tung's China of the 1960's and those of the earlier rulers, lend credence to the contention that the Chinese Communists are Chinese first and Communists only second.

"Conflict in the Shadows: The Nature and Politics of Guerrilla War," by James E. Cross (1963): A contemporary analysis of the history of guerrilla warfare, its military and political implications, and the means of combating it that are available to the West. The book includes an evaluation of the theories of Mao Tse-tung, T. E. Lawrence and Che Guevara, in the light of major historical and current insurrections.

"Limited War and American Defense Policy," by Seymour J. Deitchman (1964): A timely and comprehensive analysis of limited war, including a history of such wars over the past 20 years, the kinds of limited war likely to face the United States, and the areas and environment where they may be fought. The book considers tactical nuclear weapons, battlefield mobility, tactical air support, command and control, force structure, and the impact of technology on limited war; and examines the issues to be resolved and the alternatives available to bring U.S. military capabilities into consonance with U.S. foreign policy.

"How Russia Is Ruled," (Rev. ed.) by Merle Fainsod (1963): A most authoritative and comprehensive source book on the political and social structure of pre-Khrushchev Communist Russia, brought up to date, in this revised and enlarged edition, with a discussion and analysis of the Khrushchev era—through December 1962. Included are: 1) an historical analysis of those forces, factors, and events that caused the Russian Revolution, of the Bolshevik takeover, and of the subsequent transformation of the character of the regime under Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev; 2) the role of the Party in theory and practice; 3) the organizations and instruments employed by the Party to maintain control of the State; and 4) an analysis of the impact of Party controls on industry and agriculture, and of the problems and tensions arising therefrom.

"Southeast Asia in United States Policy," by Russell H. Fifield (1963): An exhaustive, historical review of the social, cultural, political, economic, and military pressures that have influenced the development of Southeast Asia, as well as Far Eastern, South Asian, and Australian postures in the world today. In addition, the book analyzes U.S. policy toward Southeast Asia and evaluates U.S. objectives, doctrine, and tactics associated with the efforts to create area stability and viable, independent governments under the mantle of that stability.

"Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice," by David Galula (1964): A well-organized discussion of the causes of insurgency, with an analysis of the stages or phases in the development of insurgency

and the delineation of a step-by-step politico-military approach toward combating and defeating revolutionary war. The author is a French officer whose intimate knowledge of his subject was obtained through personal experience as an observer of, or participant in most of the major counterinsurgency campaigns conducted during the past 20 years.

"Scientists and National Policy-making," edited by Robert Gilpin and Christopher Wright (1964): Ten scholars examine aspects of the roles of scientists in national policy-making; the place to which scientists have risen in American political life and the reasons for this development; the activities of science in relation to national security; and the new types of expertise that must be developed by "scientific strategists" to cope with the problems created by the interactions of science, technology, and society.

"Command Decisions," edited by Kent R. Greenfield (1959): Twenty command decisions of World War II, seven concerning the war in the Pacific and thirteen dealing with operations in Europe and Africa, are discussed and evaluated by sixteen historians of the Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army. The dilemmas, alternatives and options involved in such controversial operations as the attack of Pearl Harbor, the withdrawal to Bataan, the landings at Anzio, the Normandy invasion, the closing of the Argentan-Falaise gap, and the use of the atomic bomb are analyzed in detail and in a scholarly and objective fashion.

"China and the Bomb," by Morton H. Halperin (1965): A timely treatment of a critically important subject. The book effectively analyzes the antagonisms and mutual suspicions existing between the United States and the Chinese Communists, the means by which Red China developed the bomb, and the strategic implications of her nuclear potential in the present fabric of national power relationships.

"Decision-Making for Defense," by Charles J. Hitch (1965): A composite of four Gaither Memorial lectures delivered at the University of California by the former Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), this book provides a basis for the cost-accounting approach to decision-making. Included are the evolution of the national military establishment from 1789 to the beginning of the Kennedy administration, a description of programming and the application of cost-effectiveness studies to decision-making, and an evaluation of these techniques.

"The Common Defense: Strategic Programs in National Politics," by Samuel P. Huntington (1961): An examination of the strategic aspect of the military policy of the United States with focus on the period from 1945 to 1960 and including an analysis of the political processes involved in the development of strategic programs within the American system of government. A thorough review of NSC 68, the New Look, The New New Look, and other current strategies and programs is undertaken, together with a discussion of the influences of fiscal and domestic policies, party politics and interservice rivalries on the innovation of strategic programs.

"Decisive Battles of World War II: The German View," edited by Hans A. Jacobsen and Jurgen Rohwer. Translated from the German by Edward Fitzgerald (1965): Ten selected campaigns of World War II are discussed by German historians, many of them distinguished military commanders. Included are campaigns from Dunkirk to the Ardennes. Tactical conduct of the operation is reviewed as well as the relation of controlling elements such as geography, political systems, resources, and intelligence. Each campaign concludes with a summary of the lessons to be learned.

"The McNamara Strategy," by William W. Kaufmann (1964): An excellent and detailed narrative account of the changes made in the Department of Defense since the beginning of the Kennedy administration with the em-

phasis on Secretary McNamara's actions and the rationale behind them. The "search for options" is described, as well as the long term considerations of the Secretary with respect to nuclear power, conventional forces, arms control, and research and development. The book also discusses, with clarity and simplicity, the system of planning and budgeting which has been established in the Department, and evaluates some defense implications for the future.

"Problems of National Strategy," edited by Henry A. Kissinger (1965): This anthology of readings on basic national security policy is of equal value to the serious student of national strategy and the lay reader. In presenting viewpoints on both sides of key issues, Dr. Kissinger, Professor of Government at Harvard University, provides an excellent representation of governmental, scientific, and academic thought on the major defense policy problems confronting the United States today.

"The Troubled Partnership," by Henry A. Kissinger (1965): The study deals with the future of the Atlantic Community and examines U.S. relations with and policies toward Western Europe. The book also examines the changes in thinking that have occurred since the development of the Alliance and presents the background to the problems of deterrence as well as a critical appraisal of the multilateral force concept.

"International Politics in a Revolutionary Age," by W. W. Kulski (1964): An examination of the important aspects of the relations between contemporary states—political, military, economic, ideological, legal, and diplomatic—in depth and detail, and in the multiple perspectives of the Western bloc, the Communist bloc, and the developing nations. A view of the revolutionary trends and awesome complexities facing today's leaders as they seek the solutions to the problems of international politics.

"The Age of Overkill: A Preface to World Politics," by Max Lerner (1962): An analysis of the conduct of world politics in the Age of Overkill. The book describes the present roster of power centers and the grand design of communism; analyzes the broad military, social, ethical, and political forces in the nations of the world; examines their leadership; and concludes with a discussion of a hopeful transition to world order as the only alternative to world destruction now that man can move beyond the power principle in world politics.

"Latin America: Myth and Reality," by Peter Nehemkis (1964): A comprehensive review of the history and development of Central and South America, blending competent analysis with concise factual reporting. Opposing points of view are presented objectively and military, political, sociological and economic implications significant to the current world power struggle are examined thoroughly and perceptively.

"Modern Guerrilla Warfare: Fighting Communist Guerrilla Movements, 1941-1961," edited by Franklin M. Osanka (1962): A symposium of writings on major guerrilla activities during the last 20 years. The book is organized in three parts, with the first reviewing guerrilla warfare in the past and its modern strategic uses; the second, a world coverage on the application of guerrilla principles; and the concluding section dealing with counter guerrilla procedures and policies.

"The Dynamics of International Politics," by Norman J. Padelford and George A. Lincoln (1962): The framework for a systematic analysis of a rapidly changing political world, the text examines: the major social, economic and political problems operating in the sphere of international relations; the attempts of nations to influence and manipulate these forces by means of their foreign policies; the techniques and instruments which translate policies into effective programs of action; and, the concerted attempts

of nations to organize an international community for peace, security and welfare.

"George C. Marshall: Vol. 1—Education of a General, 1880-1939; Vol. 2—Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942," by Forrest C. Pogue (1962): The first two volumes of a projected 4-volume definitive biography. Vol. 1 follows Marshall's progress from his childhood in Uniontown, Pa., to 1939 when Hitler marched into Poland and Marshall took the oath as Chief of Staff of the United States Army. The development of the United States as a world power, and of Marshall's early role in that development, are shown. Vol. 2 carries his career in Washington through the difficult early years of World War II, and portrays his skillful leadership in the struggle to strengthen the Army.

"Africa: A Foreign Affairs Reader," by Philip W. Quigg (1964): An edition of 24 articles that have appeared in Foreign Affairs over the past 40 years. The diverse opinions presented on diverse political and social convolutions, and covering so extended a period of time, provide a broad spectrum of useful information for the reader who is interested in analyzing the forces that will shape Africa's future.

"American Strategy: A New Perspective," by Urs Schwarzwald (1966): This book presents an interesting and balanced study of the growth of strategic thinking in the United States as seen by the foreign editor of a Swiss newspaper. After tracing U.S. strategic thought through both World Wars to 1966, the author concludes with the analysis that NATO has failed primarily because European thinkers and leaders have failed to keep pace with and to understand the strategic theories and concepts advanced by the United States.

"The President As World Leader," by Sidney Warren (1964): An historical study of the men who have occupied the office of the President during the period of America's transition from traditional isolation to intimate involvement in world affairs. This book is a study of those men, from Theodore Roosevelt to John F. Kennedy, who played the major role in the shaping of U.S. foreign policy, and of the fundamental changes brought about in the nature of the Presidency itself.

"Soviet Strategy at the Crossroads," by Thomas W. Wolfe (1964): An interesting study and scholarly analysis of Soviet documents which traces the course of the Khrushchev-Malinovsky debate over defense strategy and over the priority for the allocation of national resources between consumer and defense industries. The book also provides an insight into the military's demands for a greater measure of autonomy in basic policy-making and Malinovsky's concern about the excessive Party-political intrusion into military affairs.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

HAROLD K. JOHNSON,
General, United States Army,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

KENNETH G. WICKHAM,
Major General, United States Army,
The Adjutant General.

Distribution: To be distributed in accordance with DA Form 12-9 requirements for Administration: Active Army: A. NG: None. USAR: None.

[ARMY REGULATIONS No. 28-86]

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington 25, D.C., March 6, 1963.

WELFARE, RECREATION, AND MORALE—UNITED STATES ARMY CONTEMPORARY MILITARY READING PROGRAM

	Paragraph
General	1
Purpose	2
Annual list	3
Responsibility	4
Availability of books	5

1. General. The complexities of modern warfare require that all military leaders keep themselves currently informed on military affairs, as well as matters of national and international interest. The voluntary reading of authoritative, provocative, and timely books in these fields is an important adjunct to more formal training towards this objective. The U.S. Army Contemporary Military Reading Program has been established to assist Army personnel by calling attention to, and making available, books of professional value and interest. It is emphasized, however, that the selection of a book for inclusion in the program does not imply an official indorsement by the Department of the Army of the views contained therein.

2. Purpose. This Army-wide program is designed to stimulate constructive thinking concerning problems of prevailing and future military importance; encourage Army personnel to engage in a systematic program of voluntary reading to improve their professional competence; deepen comprehension and understanding of the significant role of the Army in world affairs; furnish guidance in the selection of reading materials through publication of an annual list of books written by outstanding authorities on military and allied subjects; and make copies of these books readily available for loan to military personnel.

3. Annual list. An annual reading list comprised of up-to-date titles in the fields of military science and world affairs will be published as a DA circular.

4. Responsibility. a. Under the supervision of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, The Adjutant General provides technical direction and staff supervision over all matters pertaining to the administration and operation of this program.

b. The Commandant, United States Army War College, reviews the annual list and recommends to The Adjutant General additions to and deletions from the list.

c. Commanders at all echelons are responsible for actions necessary to insure the success of this program. While the reading of recommended books is voluntary, promotional efforts should be directed toward stimulating personnel to read as many books as possible.

5. Availability of books. a. Copies of all books on the current annual list will be available for loan from Army installation libraries, an activity of Special Services.

b. Army personnel not having ready access to an Army installation library may arrange for loan of these books from the nearest Army installation library. For this purpose, direct correspondence between the individual and the post librarian concerned is authorized. Official envelopes or labels with the postage and fees paid indicia may be used for this purpose. See AR 341-10. Army personnel stationed at MAAGs and missions may arrange for direct loan of books by contacting the Special Services Office of the nearest overseas command.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

EARLE G. WHEELER,
General, United States Army,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

J. C. LAMBERT,
Major General, United States Army,
The Adjutant General.

Distribution: Active Army: To be distributed in accordance with DA Form 12-9 requirements for DA Regulations—Administration—A. NG: None. USAR: None.

Bartlett, Ruhl J. *Policy and Power; Two Centuries of American Foreign Relations*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1963. (JX1416 B3151); Review by Col K. W. Kennedy.

This book traces the history of American foreign policy from the seeds of the revolution, through the Cuban crisis, to the present. It sets forth some little known background of political maneuvering and the

thinking of our national leaders as we gradually emerged from a century of isolation to a world power with vast economic and political commitments. The author pulls no punches in describing how the United States assumed an imperialistic stance based upon its growing military and economic might. While emphasizing American foreign policy and diplomacy, *Policy and Power* also provides the reader with an excellent review of American history.

Beaufre, Andre. *An Introduction to Strategy*. New York: Praeger, 1965. (U161 B38 1965); Reviewed by Col. H. W. Lange.

This small and extremely interesting book by retired French General Beaufre is important to individuals at the US Army War College level. It will probably become a classic—more famous than the books of Aron, Kahn, or Kissinger. Far from writing solely *An Introduction to Strategy*, the author leads readers toward new thinking about past strategies and present or future world conditions. He stresses that rigid or partial hypotheses (including certain US interest in mathematical evaluation) can prevent complete thought about changes in operational strategy.

General Beaufre has the distinction of being the first general of his high grade to write a well-rounded theoretical study of modern strategy. He has been highly regarded in France because of his remarkably young appointment to the General Staff (1935), his position as a deputy for operation in the First French Army during World War II, and with the CINC (General de Lattre de Tassigny) in Indochina. He commanded the ground forces at Suez and later served with SHAPE and the Standing Group in Washington.

His reported "early" retirement in April 1962 may infer some disagreement with President de Gaulle, although there were no such indications previously. His book contains a few comments hardly acceptable to de Gaulle, such as: a) the credibility of a second-rank nation threatening to use counter-city nuclear weapons is weak; b) a visible state must be so large that international entities are bound to form; c) an international force will become feasible; and d) the decline of the West comes from its lack of a united front.

His continued activity as the civilian Director of the French Institute of Strategic Studies (an "unofficial" agency established by the Ministry of Defense) will be watched with interest as a result of this book.

A thorough analysis of strategy results from the author's review of the key strategists from ancient times to modern. He weighs strategy as an art—not a science. He defines its many aspects, lists the components and identifies the patterns so that new facets are added to even the extensive reasoning of current American "intellectuals." He warns that it is a dangerous misconception to believe that the evolution of strategy depends on tactics or techniques.

The Beaufre concept is that, while military force is important, there are invisible but most definite limits to the use of direct armed actions. The recognition of the type of situation, or "area of freedom" where military resources may be employed, is part of the new art of strategy. Preparation for this action is now more important than the execution thereof. Most unprecedented is that there is now a vital component, which Beaufre terms "indirect strategy," whereby force is applied through nonmilitary fields. Thus the protean forms of national power can be applied. Each Department (Ministry) must have its own "overall" strategy in its particular field. The Head of Government then orchestrates the product of these components into a national "total" strategy.

All too often people have not perceived that the focal point of struggle was not in the area where fighting was taking place but outside it.

It is impossible to stop "erosion warfare" until a new type deterrent is developed against the enemy's indirect strategy; one must also reduce his area of freedom for military action.

Outer Space, Prospects For Man and Society, edited by Lincoln P. Bloomfield. Published by Prentice-Hall Inc., 1962. 202 pages (TL 790 A43).

Outer Space was prepared to provide background for the discussions of the Twentieth American Assembly at Columbia University October 1961. The eight chapters, each prepared by a different author considered by the editor to be especially well qualified in that particular field, provide an excellent summary of the various aspects of the impact of outer space exploration on society. Both the present and the next twenty years are considered. The technical, economic, military and legal problems posed by Outer Space exploration are presented for consumption by a general audience. The task of government, possible peaceful uses, problems of international cooperation, and public policy considerations are also briefly analyzed in a manner easily understood by the lay reader. The discussion of the status of solutions to the technical aspects of space exploration and some factors to be considered in the development of US policies for space activities are particularly informative.

Recommendation: It is recommended that *Outer Space* be added to both the CMRL and the USAWCRL. It provides coverage for an area of vital importance which is not presently covered by either list hence is not properly a substitute for any book presently on the list.

Claude, Inis L. *Power and International Relations*. New York: Random House, 1962. (JX1395 C 55); reviewed by Col. J. G. Kalergis.

This book is a study of the problem of the management of power in international relations. As used by Inis L. Claude, power denotes a military capability; that is, specifically those elements which contribute directly or indirectly to the capacity to coerce, kill, and destroy. Mr. Claude points out that the management of power is the real issue in the world today.

As expressed in this book the theory of international relations contains three basic concepts which may be regarded as relevant to the problem of the management of power: balance of power, collective security, and world government. In his book, Mr. Claude examines, compares, and evaluates these three basic concepts as theoretical approaches to the problem of the management of power in international relations.

On balance of power the author concludes that while the suitability of the world for the operation of the balance of power system has been steadily diminishing for well over a century, the system still exists today by default since efforts to replace this system have only introduced modifications of its operative mechanisms.

Collective security is examined as an alternative to balance of power with the conclusion that while the urge to create a system of collective security has been discarded, the doctrine has left a considerable deposit.

World government as a monopoly of power, a concept associated with World War II, and the subsequent Cold War period are evaluated as a progression toward centralization of the international system. The author concludes that the theory of world government does not in itself answer the question of how catastrophic international conflict can be avoided.

The Obligations of Power: American Diplomacy in the Search for Peace. By Harlan Cleveland. 168 pages. Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966. \$4.50. Reviewed by LTC William I. Gordon.

A former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs and, pres-

ently, US Ambassador to NATO, Harlan Cleveland is eminently qualified to write this review of and forecast for US policy: "an up-to-date way for American citizens to think about the use of American power in a world of disorder and diversity." Ambassador Cleveland, as he puts it, has been "privileged to watch the management of US foreign policy from close at hand . . ." Though short, and very readable, the book presents more than a viewpoint; it contains a wealth of substance in a field of interest to all Americans. It traces the spirit of the American people which has driven us to "place our power in the service of a world of diversity." This is the opposite of imperialism and, as a policy, it is the source of the tremendous strength of our position in the world. And we're not yet stretched, though many of our citizens have expressed concern about our ability to "police the world." We have no idea of how strong we really are, and how much we can do. This, as Ambassador Cleveland notes, is a world of small wars and our power gives us some responsibility for peace everywhere. "The price of power is involvement. . . . The alternative to world war, it seems, is not world peace. It is a world full of small wars and rumors of wars."

But do we have to be involved? The answer is, "yes." Because we do not want to use our ultimate power, we must constantly be using more limited power. We are too large and powerful to hide.

The remainder of the book traces US success in the Cold War, recommends some lessons for crisis management, discusses the means by which we must search for peace, analyzes the peacekeeping abilities of the UN and the usefulness of development assistance, and addresses the problems of China in the UN and nuclear proliferation. He ends with a list of seven points to teach an American youngster which, essentially, add up to the concluding sentence of the book: "The wave of the future is still the open society—and the engine of that society is still the open mind of the free individual."

Clubb, O. Edmund. *20th Century China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964. (DS774 C55); Reviewed by Col. W. R. McCutchen.

The author, a former Consul General in Peking and presently a lecturer in Chinese history, describes his book as a "political history" of China in the twentieth century—an attempt to recount the development of present day (1962) Communist China out of the circumstances surrounding the end of the Manchurian dynasty, the Chinese Revolution of 1911 and the collapse of the Confucian order the "war lord" era and the right-wing Nationalist interregnum, and the consolidation of power under the Communists.

Mr. Clubb maintains that the Chinese Communists are Chinese first and Communists only second. In other words, their thoughts and actions are shaped more by China's past history than by a faithful adherence to Marxism-Leninism. He finds a parallel between Mao Tse-tung's autocratic, anti-feudal rule and that of Ch'in Shih Huang-ti, the first emperor of China in 250 B.C. Also, Mao's ideas of socialism are strikingly similar to those used in China 1800 years before Marx. Thus, the present-day rulers of China are true proponents of the "Middle Kingdom," with unchanging ideas of China as the ruler of a vast empire surrounded by vassal states. Communism, rather than Confucianism, serves as a more suitable cloak of legitimacy in today's world to control the Chinese people.

The kaleidoscopic changes in China's political history, particularly in the war lord era, are difficult to follow at best. Unfortunately, the author does little to help the reader through this maze. Sun Yat-sen is seen as a shadowy opportunist, who is remembered more for his Three Principles than

for any concrete political accomplishment. Chiang Kai-shek is portrayed as a right-wing, blundering militarist and an embarrassing ally of the United States.

Cross, James E. *Conflict in the Shadows*. New York: Doubleday, 1963. (U240 C71); Reviewed by Col. P. D. Phillips.

The galley proofs of *Conflict in the Shadows—The Nature and Politics of Guerrilla War* were furnished to the Commandant by the publisher. This is a very fine, solid book on counterinsurgency, not because there is too much new, but because the author writes clearly, concisely, completely, and colorfully. This short volume covers adequately the underlying social, political, and psychological facets of insurrection but with emphasis on the military. Some national policy implications are discussed in the last chapter.

Deitchman, Seymour J. *Limited War and American Defense Policy*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1964. (UA23 D38); Reviewed by Lt. Col. A. J. Hughes.

This book offers an up-to-date and very comprehensive analysis of limited war including a history of such wars over the past 20 years, the kinds of limited wars likely to face the United States, and the areas and environments where they may be fought. It considers tactical nuclear weapons, battlefield mobility, tactical air support, command and control, force structure, and the impact of technology on limited war. Comparative tables are used throughout the text with good effectiveness.

The author points out that our military and economic strength and our network of free world associations tend to demand US participation in the anti-Communist struggle. He holds that our current position of leadership leaves the United States no alternatives. He stresses, too, the importance of improving responsiveness and reducing the overall limited war threat. The book examines the issues to be resolved and alternatives available in bringing US military capabilities into consonance with US foreign policy in various parts of the world.

This is a carefully written, complete, very worthwhile study of the problems of limited war. The book is particularly timely.

Fainsod, Merle. *How Russia Is Ruled*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963. (JN6531 F3 1963). Reviewed by Colonel L. R. Selbert.

The first edition of *How Russia Is Ruled*, published in 1953, is generally acknowledged to be the most authoritative and comprehensive single English language source book on the political and social structure of pre-Khrushchev Communist Russia. The only weakness of the 1953 edition—lack of coverage of the Khrushchev era—has been corrected in this revised and enlarged 1963 edition, which includes a discussion and analysis of events through December 1962.

One of the outstanding features of the earlier printings, retained in this edition, is the method of presentation: a unique arrangement of material into four sections and seventeen chapters, all self-sufficient yet complementary. Each section and each chapter stand alone as a complete essay, yet fit neatly into the whole. This arrangement facilitates the efficient utilization of the book as a reference source in any examination of the various aspects of the Soviet Russian social experiment.

Part One is essentially a historical analysis of those forces, factors, and events which caused the Russian Revolution; of the Bolshevik takeover of the Revolution; and of the subsequent transformation of the character of the Communist regime under Lenin, Stalin, then Khrushchev. This entire section, particularly Chapters 2 and 3 which deal with Bolshevik theory and practice as applied to the Revolution, merits careful analysis by those who wish to gain a better understanding of current Communist revolutionary doctrine. The amazing success of Lenin's strategy, since repeated many times on a smaller scale,

can perhaps be more fully appreciated when one considers that with a force roughly the equivalent of the population of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, Lenin seized control of the Revolution, and subsequently of a nation of 150,000,000 persons.

Part Two deals with the Party, particularly with the evolutionary changes regarding the role of the Party in theory and practice. Although every chapter in this section contains a wealth of information, valuable in attaining a better appreciation of Party principles and methods, War College students should find Chapters 5, 7, and 10 particularly helpful in gaining an understanding of the role of the Party and of the nature of those men who have led, and are now leading, the Party. In this connection, Fainsod demonstrates that although many of the tenets of the Party have been modified—even reversed or abandoned—over the years, there are certain fundamental doctrines which no leader has as yet had the temerity to openly defy. Put another way, although tactics may change daily and strategy may change yearly, the goals and objectives of the Party have remained constant. Fainsod's analysis should prove helpful to students in determining the Soviet national purpose.

Part Three examines the organizations and instruments employed by the Party in maintaining control of the state. Here again, Fainsod demonstrates the constancy of goals and objectives as opposed to the gradual evolution in strategy and tactics. If Khrushchev has rejected Stalin's strategy of terror, it is only because he is convinced that he can achieve better results using other means. He has shown little reluctance to revert to Stalinist methods—as in the repeal of his "judicial reform" laws, or in ordering armed intervention in Hungary—when lesser control measures have failed. Khrushchev's "benevolent" leadership does not indicate any willingness to relinquish absolute Party control of the domestic or satellite populations, in Fainsod's opinion. Although Chapters 13 and 14 of this section are particularly applicable to War College students, the entire section merits careful perusal.

Part Four is devoted to an analysis of the impact of Party controls on industry and agriculture, and of the problems and tensions arising therefrom. The final chapter, completely rewritten for this edition, is devoted to an appraisal of the Soviet political system. It contains, in essence, a brief review of Parts Two, Three, and Four, with commentaries on current problems and future prospects. This chapter, in my estimation, is the highlight of this consistently outstanding book; a "must" for all War College students and faculty.

Fifield, Russell H. *Southeast Asia in United States Policy*. New York: Praeger, 1963. (DS518.8 F5); Reviewed by Lt. Col. J. F. Ladd.

Russell H. Fifield, Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan, has written a significant and comprehensive digest of far more than the policy theme which the title of his book implies. Southeast Asia runs as a core throughout the study, but the author reaches deep into the Far East, South Asia, and Australia to tie together the historical and current aspects of social, cultural, political, economic, and military pressures which have influenced the region. In addition to providing an analysis of United States policy toward Southeast Asia, this book considers and weighs US objectives, doctrines, and tactics associated with that government's efforts to create area stability and viable independent governments within the mantle of that stability. Critical problems that confront the United States in Southeast Asia are realistically brought to the fore. In many instances, however, problem areas are not developed to expose the frustrations and complications which inhibit Western-oriented solutions to

essentially oriental problems. This book is, nevertheless, an excellent vehicle for the military reader to use in reviewing the southeast Asian situation and provides a solid springboard of thought-provoking information from which further related study and analysis can be launched.

Calula, David. *Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice*. Foreword by Robert R. Bowie. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. 1964. 143 pages. \$4.50.

Although guerrilla warfare and revolutionary activities have been well recorded and documented, the methods of combatting insurgency have for the most part been neglected. This well written, well organized, relatively short book tends to answer this need. It tells the other side of the story. It goes into the causes of insurgency and stresses the point that the main idea, or the action often lacking, is the need for building a political machine from the grass roots population upward.

The author's theme is that revolutionary wars are political in nature and thus can be won only through political means. Obviously the military are involved, but a pure military victory will not remove the causes of insurgency nor bring about a lasting settlement.

The book presents a step-by-step politico-military approach to defeating insurgency and is timely and thought provoking reading for the military person.

Gilpin, Robert and Wright, Christopher, eds. *Scientists and National Policy-Making*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964. (Q127 U5G5); Reviewed by Lt. Col. A. J. Hughes.

Eight authorities in science and political science, besides the two editors, discuss concisely, critically, and not always in accord, the role of scientists in US policy-making. They endeavor to determine in what way and to what degree the involvement in advisory, administrative, or diplomatic capacities of scientists needs to be reduced, altered, or augmented to meet today's changing problems realistically and constructively.

One of the messages portrayed in the book is that scientists and politicians are gaining more mature concepts of each other. The book also assesses the actual role scientists have played and ought to play in the formulation of government policy.

The authors provide good coverage of the scientific establishment, scientists and politics, the President's Scientific Advisors, scientific strategists, and other related areas. The book provides the military reader a comprehensive, timely look at the impact of science and technology on U.S. governmental operations, decision-making and foreign policy.

Halperin, Morton H. *China and the Bomb*. New York: Praeger, 1965. (JX1570.5 H3); Reviewed by Col. M. Goldenthal.

This is a timely treatment of a critically important subject which probably portends a shift in the present fabric of national power relationships. Mr. Halperin is particularly effective in his clear analyses of (1) the antagonisms and mutual suspicions which have existed between the US and Red China; (2) how and why Red China developed the "bomb"; and (3) Red China's nuclear potential and strategy.

Unfortunately, Mr. Halperin's attempts at establishing guidelines for American policy and at analyzing the implications of Red China's nuclear capability are understandably less lucid. Both attempts rather hurriedly enunciate the many variables involved and raise more questions than are answered. These variables are more or less painfully obvious and the author's academic treatment points out the various alternative opportunities in formulating US policy. In short, Mr. Halperin is excellent in treating the past but somewhat less authoritative with the present and future. However, at least he has collected most of the current ideas

and views on this vexing problem in his short book.

Decision-Making for Defense. By Charles J. Hitch. 78 pages. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California, 1965. \$2.95; reviewed by LTC William I. Gordon.

In January 1961, Charles J. Hitch was appointed Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) by President Kennedy with the mandate to organize the financial management system of the Defense Department in terms of meaningful program entities—to enable the Secretary of Defense to look at the defense program and budget in terms of major military missions.

As Mr. Hitch points out, the financial management system not only must provide a budget in a form acceptable to the Congress but it must also "provide the data needed by top management to make the really crucial decisions, particularly on the major forces and weapons systems needed to carry out the principal missions of the defense establishment." Programming, a new function, and one that provided a bridge between military planning and the budget, was Mr. Hitch's contribution to the system.

The book is a composite of four Gaither Memorial Lectures delivered by Mr. Hitch at the University of California. The first of the series traces the evolution of the national military establishment from 1789 to the beginning of the Kennedy Administration. The second and third describe the purposes and functioning of programming and the application of the techniques of cost-effectiveness studies to decisionmaking. Finally, in the last chapter, the book attempts to evaluate these innovations and to defend, in particular, the device of the "cost-effectiveness" study against the not infrequent criticism leveled against it since 1961.

The book is an excellent primer for those who would understand the present system of defense management and, as such, can provide an interesting introduction to any military and civilian personnel who will be entering the Pentagon for their first assignment in those busy halls.

It is unfortunate, however, that it does not provide answers to the many questions concerning the effectiveness of systems analysis or whether and how this technique has been applied by the top defense management in arriving at the far-reaching decisions of the past four years.

The Common Defense. Strategic Programs in National Politics, by Samuel P. Huntington. 500 pages. Columbia University Press, 1961.

To paraphrase the author, this book examines not what military policy ought to be, but what it has been and why. Its focus is on the strategic aspect of that policy during the period from 1945 to 1960.

The New Look, NSC 68, The New New Look, the "remainder method" of budgeting, interservice rivalries—all of these and numerous other aspects of military policy are examined in this scholarly and objective work.

The portion which probably is of greatest interest to the professional soldier examines the political processes involved in the development of strategic programs. Such diverse subjects as lobbying and an explanation of how the executive actually legislates strategic programs give an insight into strategy making, which could not be gained except by participation in the highest levels of government.

The book also analyzes in detail our development of different programs, examines four of these (strategic deterrence, European defense, continental defense, and limited war), studies the influences on fiscal policy, and closes with thoughts on the period "beyond deterrence."

Some statements in the book will make the professional soldier uncomfortable. Some

are open to question, if not outright argument. But the reader will find it difficult to find fault with either the reasoning or the detailed research of the author.

This book will be of interest to those who have served, are serving, or will serve on a high-level staff.

Decisive Battles of World War II: The German View. Edited by Hans A. Jacobsen and Jurgen Rohwer. Introduction by Cyril Falls. Translated from the German by Edward Fitzgerald. 509 pages. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1965. \$10.00; reviewed by Col. D. P. Boyer, Jr.

Dedicated to Frederick the Great's maxim, "Experience is useless unless the right conclusions are drawn from it," ten German historians—some of them distinguished military commanders in World War II—have prepared a distinguished contribution to field of military history. Each writer has concentrated on one of ten selected battle-campaigns: Dunkirk, the air war over Britain, Crete, Moscow in 1941, Mediterranean in 1942, Stalingrad, U-boat campaign of 1943, Normandy, collapse of Army Group Center in Russia in 1944, and the Ardennes ("Battle of the Bulge").

By far the most readable, in the opinion of this reviewer, of various accounts by German authors on the conduct of World War II, each campaign study is concluded with a summary of what we in the US Army term "Lessons learned." Of interest to a War College reader is the attention given, not alone to the tactical conduct of the campaign and the influence of Hitler, but to the controlling elements of geography, political systems, resources, and—above all—to the necessity for accurate intelligence.

This authoritative and objective volume should be read by every serious student of World War II.

Kaufmann, Willm W. The McNamara Strategy. New York: Harper & Row, 1964. (UA23 K281); reviewed by Lt Col N. A. Parsons.

The McNamara Strategy is an excellent detailed narrative account of the changes which the nation's leaders have made in the Department of Defense since the beginning of the Kennedy administration. The emphasis is on Secretary McNamara's actions and the rationale behind his actions. The book is rather biased in favor of the administration and Secretary McNamara specifically. The author, often in the Pentagon on a consultant basis, voluntarily submitted the manuscript to the Defense Department for clearance; the result is a description of a McNamara who can do no wrong.

The author first describes developments prior to 1961 and the situation which existed when Secretary McNamara took office. The second chapter discusses the "search for options" to present the communist world with an effective response to any form of aggression. NATO problems and the Secretary's actions with respect to them are then presented in considerable detail. A chapter entitled "The Long View" follows, presenting the long term considerations of Secretary McNamara with respect to nuclear power, buildup of conventional forces, arms control, and research and development. Chapter 5 describes with remarkable clarity and simplicity the system of planning and budgeting (almost synonymous terms to McNamara) which was established. A rigorous technique of weighing cost against effectiveness, not to establish a budget ceiling but to establish an adequate military force, is now a way of life in the Pentagon.

Following a most interesting narrative of the political controversy which Secretary McNamara's changes have created, the author attempts to prove how effective these changes have been in the international arena—and with some success. The final two chapters point out some of the defense implications of the future, a future dominated by a brilliant, dynamic Secretary of Defense.

The book depends heavily upon quotations from Secretary McNamara's speeches and congressional sessions. Some direct interviews and extensive staff interviews are also relied upon. Although the book is entirely sympathetic to Mr. McNamara's point of view, it is the most complete and succinct discussion of the Secretary's actions and the reasons behind them on the market.

Problems of National Strategy. Edited by Henry A. Kissinger. 477 pages. Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1965. \$8.50; reviewed by LTC D. E. Fowler.

Dr. Kissinger, the eminent Professor of Government at Harvard University, has carefully compiled an anthology of readings on basic national security policy which can be of great value to both the serious student of national strategy and the lay reader.

In presenting viewpoints on both sides of key issues, Dr. Kissinger provides a better than fair representation of governmental, scientific and academic thought on the major defense policy problems confronting the United States today.

The book is divided into five parts; each with an introductory chapter, written by Dr. Kissinger, that serves to clarify the issues that will be discussed. The five areas covered provide a brief outline of US problems: Strategic Doctrine and American Defense Policy; Alliances in the Nuclear Age; Neutrality and the Problem of Insurgency; the Control of Modern Weapons, and; National Security Policy and Governmental Organization. The authors of the 25 articles are eminently qualified to write in these areas, and include such experts as: Kahn, McNamara, Enthoven, Schelling, Buchan, Gallois, Kennedy, Rusk, and Teller.

Dr. Kissinger completes his masterful assembly effort by prefacing each article with an introduction to the author and an analysis of his thesis.

In all, the book is recommended reading for anyone, student or dilettante, interested in the real problems of national strategy facing the United States.

Kissinger, Henry A. The Troubled Partnership: A Re-appraisal of the Atlantic Alliance. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965 (JX 1987 A41K44); reviewed by Col S. V. Titterud.

The Troubled Partnership is the first book of the Atlantic Policy Study undertaken by the Council on Foreign Relations. The study deals with the future of the Atlantic Community and examines United States relations with and policies toward Western Europe. Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, author and lecturer in the fields of national and international politics, Professor of Government and a faculty member of The Center of International Affairs, Harvard University, presents a well-argued and illuminating reappraisal of the Atlantic alliance.

The book examines the changes of thinking that have occurred since the development of the Atlantic relationship and gives a background on problems of deterrence and alliances of this community. President de Gaulle's policies are assessed in comparison to those of the United States in order to give a better understanding to the overall problem facing Western Europe. A critical appraisal is made of the MLF. Kissinger says that the most important lesson learned regarding the MLF is not to try to solve political problems with technical expedients. He proposes an allied nuclear force with certain limitations and a united Europe through a partnership. He further argues that the Atlantic Community cannot have a dominant partner as they have had—"it is the community rather than American control which is the best cohesion of the alliance."

Kulski, Wladyslaw W. International Politics in a Revolutionary Age. New York: Lipincott, 1964. (D843 K8); reviewed by Lt Col D. E. Fowler.

This new text on international relations is one of the most "readable" to the non-professional political scientist that has been

published. Professor Kulski has succeeded admirably in his effort to cover the international relations spectrum by an eclectic approach for the nonspecialist and the practitioner. His introduction contains a concise historical view of the field of international relations, foreign policy, contemporary paradoxes, and also defines key terms of the profession. The remaining chapters cover military strategy (including disarmament), alliances, the nation-state and nationalism, national power, the East-West conflict, international law, morality and public opinion, economic tools, international organizations (not solely the UN), diplomacy (including propaganda), and an extensive discussion of the developing nations (3 chapters). This last topic includes racism, demography, economic and social factors, colonialism, urbanization, industrialization, and foreign aid.

The material in the book provides a basic understanding of international relations—the book is a primer in international politics. The categorized table of contents along with two indices, one by place-names and one by subjects, facilitates reference. There is an extensive bibliography arranged by function.

Prof. Kulski spent 17 years in the Polish Foreign Service, 4 years as a professor at the University of Alabama, and since 1951 has been a professor at Syracuse University. He thus writes as both an academician and an experienced diplomat.

Lerner, Max. *The Age of Overkill; a Preface to World Politics*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1962. (D843 L43); reviewed by Col. A. W. Masters.

This book is an important scholarly work which reflects tremendous depth of research, excellent analytical logic, and a degree of intuitive perception not normally found in political tomes. As the subtitle suggests, the book is a reflection of Mr. Lerner's belief that the old political order is dead and a new political world order is evolving. The author focuses specifically on broad military, social, ethical, and political forces and relates these forces to what could be the world of tomorrow. For this he coins the word "possibilism."

The thesis of the book is that the transition to world order is the only alternative to world destruction. This thesis, of course, has been supported by many other scholarly works which have been published since 1625. To Mr. Lerner's credit is the fact that he supports his judgment with a logic of reality rather than with a logic of emotionalism. The author calls on knowledge in depth of all the major academic disciplines. Further, he recognizes and exploits the ideas found in the arts and mythology. Throughout you sense Mr. Lerner's skill as a practicing journalist who knows people of all type and who knows intuitively how they will react in various situations.

In summing up, Mr. Lerner dips into psychology projected on a world-wide basis to determine in his mind whether civilization as a whole will fulfill a "death wish" or whether it will follow the opposite emotional drive toward accommodation to sustain life. Happily Mr. Lerner believes the latter will occur and that not only will civilization survive but also that man will move beyond the power principle in politics to a point where controlled power will find its place as a tool to insure world order and the good life for the majority of the people in it.

The prose in this book is lyrical in a sense and throughout Mr. Lerner's tremendous skill in using applicable metaphors and aphorisms greatly enhances the pleasure in its reading.

Nehemkis, Peter. *Latin America: Myth and Reality*. New York: Knopf, 1964. (F1408 N4); reviewed by Col. P. L. Bogen.

Throughout the book the impact of the world power struggle and the importance of developing areas is presented in objective yet stimulating manner. The restrained thor-

oughness with which opposing forces are analyzed and opposing points of view presented makes this a model of academic objectivity.

The style is a pleasing blend of personalized analysis, concise factual reporting, and shrewd analysis. "Latin America, Myth and Reality" presents a comprehensive review of the history and development of Central and South America. It is a fine blend of historical and current fact and thoughtful political, sociological, and economic analysis. Full consideration is given to the military situation, implications, and role in the area.

Osanka, Franklin M., ed. *Modern Guerrilla Warfare: Fighting Communist Guerrilla Movements, 1941-1961*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962. (U240 08); reviewed by Lt. Col. C. L. Steel, Jr.

Modern Guerrilla Warfare is a symposium of writings on major guerrilla activities worldwide during the last twenty years. The book is organized in three parts with the first being a review of guerrilla warfare in the past and its modern strategic uses; the second being a world coverage on the application of guerrilla principles; and the concluding section dealing with counter guerrilla procedures and policies. The introduction by Huntington is particularly noteworthy in that he gives comprehensive classification of wars and warfare of today and tomorrow. A bibliography is included with over 600 references and represents perhaps the finest bibliography on this portion of the spectrum of warfare. Present American policy is well covered by Presidential Advisor, W. W. Rostow, whose article stems from a graduation address given at the Army Special Warfare Center at Fort Bragg in 1961 and which has been reproduced in many different publications. The worldwide coverage is particularly interesting in that it vividly portrays both the common characteristics and the facets which are peculiar to a given country or region.

Although the general reader may not be interested in all the articles, he will certainly find ample food for thought on this most vital subjects in today's world war.

Padelford, Norman, J., and Lincoln, George A. *The Dynamics of International Politics*. New York: Macmillan, 1962. (JX1308 P281); reviewed by Col. R. W. Schafer.

The authors consider the subject of international relations as an involved, active, and ever changing field of study. They have divided their analysis of international relations into five major subdivisions, the first of which depicts the setting of international politics today. Here, in providing the basic ingredients of international relations, the authors discuss the nation-state system, the balance of power system, bipolarity, international organization, and new forces such as nationalism and technology which are having a profound effect on the international order. They also establish their approach to international politics as essentially a pragmatic examination of the present, looking for the various pressures which affect the actions and interactions of states.

The second part of the text examines major social, economic, and political factors, e.g., population, geography, technology, economics, psychology, ideology, nationalism, imperialism, colonialism, and the quest for security, which cut across the patterns of states and their relationships. Part Three directs attention to the nature and role of foreign policy and to the political processes by which the United States, parliamentary democracies, and Communist nations evolve their foreign policies. Part Four analyzes the use of diplomacy, armed force, economic actions, and psychological tools as instruments by which a state executes its plan of action in the pursuit of its national goals. In the final section of the text the authors deal with the formalized aspects of the world

order, assessing the role of international law in the world today and discussing both the universal approach to world organization, principally the United Nations, and the more limited groupings of states, e.g., NATO.

This volume is a well-balanced text on the principles of international relations, and its information is presented in an interesting and challenging manner.

Pogue, Forrest C. *George C. Marshall: Ordeal and Hope, 1939-1942*. New York: Viking Press, 1966. (E745 M37P6 v. 2); reviewed by Col. G. S. Pappas.

This second volume of Pogue's biography of General of the Army George C. Marshall is of particular interest and value to the professional soldier. Covering the period from 1939 to 1942, the book constantly points out ways by which Marshall tried to prepare the small United States Army for its future involvement in the war, involvement which was obvious to every serious-thinking American of the time. His diplomatic liaison with Congress and other executive branch officials, his negotiations with British officials, his concern over economic effects of increasing the armed forces, his problems with temperamental subordinates, his efforts to program Army growth—each of these, and all, teach a military lesson to the reader. The preparations for the North African landings, discussions about the eventual invasion of Europe, and the worries of the Pacific theater also add to the value of the work. This book is a must for the reading list—the biography, when completed, will rank beside Freeman's "Robert E. Lee" as one of the finest of the century.

Africa: A Foreign Affairs Reader, synopsis by Col. H. W. Lange; edited by Philip W. Quigg; published by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., New York, 1964.

This edition of 24 selections, by different authors, presents articles which have appeared in *Foreign Affairs* over the past 40 years—1924 to 1963.

It is intriguing to read items from a period seemingly so remote and to view their relationship to known events. The selections are spread: a few in the 1920s, a few in the mid-period, and most in the latest decade.

The division of Africa among European nations did not seem open to challenge—it was either first come first served, or else the lion's share to the boldest and strongest.

Yet in the span of the articles in this book the discussion of African affairs and the points of reference have changed. The different colonial systems—regardless of their merit—had reached an end. A virtually bloodless transformation, without precedent in the growth of numerous new states, has occurred.

The authors contributing to *Foreign Affairs* were truly free to write as they saw fit and to present diverse opinions. The magazine accepted articles with contradicting points of view—each with elements of truth—and the reader may thereby apprehend the political forces which will be shaping Africa in the future.

The subjects mostly concentrate on "Black Africa" and especially on the political and social aspects. Contrasts between the English and French colonial procedures, viewed by the colonialists themselves and now analyzed by scholarly commentators or critiqued by the incumbent African leaders, are clearly instructive.

For the specialist in African affairs certain of the articles provide a most valuable explanation of the racial and tribal foundations to the regional problems.

"American Strategy: A New Perspective." By Urs Schwarz. Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966. \$4.50. Reviewed by LTC D. E. Fowler.

This book presents a very interesting and balanced study of the growth of strategic thinking in the United States as seen by the foreign editor of a Swiss newspaper. In the

first third of the book, he traces the history of United States strategic thought through both World Wars, providing an excellent insight into the traditional sharp division between policy (or politics) and military affairs. The remainder of the book is devoted to the significant trends in United States strategic thinking down to the present (1966). He explains in very clear terms various aspects of our current strategic thought and the contributions that the leading individual writers have made to debate. He concludes by stating that NATO has failed primarily because European thinkers and leaders have failed to keep pace with and to understand the strategic theories and concepts advanced by the United States for the common defense of the North Atlantic Community.

While this small book (178 pages) is not, in my view, "a comprehensive study on the growth of strategic thinking in the United States of America" (as inferred by the author), it does provide a very fine over-view of the subject.

Warren, Sidney. *The President as World Leader*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1964. (JX-1416 W34); reviewed by Col. W. R. McCutchen.

Although the United States has become one of the major world powers in the Twentieth Century, the nation has assumed its role of world leadership with reluctance. The men who have occupied the office of the President during this period have played the major part of shaping American foreign policy during this period of halting transition from traditional isolation to intimate involvement in world affairs.

This book is a story of these men, from Theodore Roosevelt to John F. Kennedy. It is also an analysis of that foreign policy which they were chiefly responsible for creating and carrying out. Along with the changing role of the United States in world affairs, there were fundamental changes brought about in the nature of the Presidency itself. The author also shows clearly the interpretation each President made of the responsibilities and prerogatives of his office.

This is an informative and often dramatic account of modern United States history, focused as it is on the President as the chief actor. It is probably the first major treatment of this history in this manner.

"Soviet Strategy at the Crossroads." By Thomas W. Wolfe. 342 Pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964. \$5.95. By Lt. Col. William I. Gordon, Inf.

On November 28, 1964, the Soviet Union disclosed the appointment of Marshal Matvia Zakharov as Chief of the General Staff, restoring him to a post he held for the three years prior to February 1963.

Zakharov, who is one of the conservative members of the Soviet Defense establishment, was a victim of the Khrushchev-Malinovsky battle over defense strategy which has been waged behind the Kremlin walls for the past several years.

The issues were clear-cut. Khrushchev was an advocate of qualitative military superiority over the West, believed that any future war must be short and would be won or lost in the first nuclear exchange, that the advent of thermonuclear weapons made any kind of confrontation with the United States foolhardy and dangerous and demanded political and Party primacy over military matters.

Malinovsky, the Defense Minister, is the leader of the conservative military group which urged quantitative as well as qualitative superiority over the West, pressed for the retention of massive armies to fight protracted wars, sought a greater measure of military autonomy in basic policymaking and looked upon excessive Party-political intrusion into military affairs as a threat to military effectiveness.

Thomas W. Wolfe, a retired Air Force offi-

cer and now a senior staff member of the Social Science Department, The RAND Corporation, has traced the debate between Khrushchev and his military leaders as it has been revealed in a wealth of Soviet source material.

Khrushchev had appeared to be winning the battle and his replacement of Zakharov with Marshal Sergei Viryusov (a Khrushchev adherent and rocket expert) was one illustration of his success. (Viryusov was killed in an airplane crash in Yugoslavia in October.)

The final blow to the conservative forces appeared to be the Soviet budget published in December 1963 which reduced the military forces and gave a major share of national resources to consumer industry.

How much this blow to the military affected Khrushchev's ouster is not yet known. But the restoration of Zakharov to his high post may indicate a vindication of Malinovsky's position. The future course of Malinovsky's fortunes is still in doubt, however, and Mr. Wolfe has done us all a service in his clear and well-documented analysis of the debate. Soviet strategy is still at the crossroads. Which path it takes is of the greatest concern to the Free World.

MEMORANDUM NO. 621-4¹

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE,
Carlisle Barracks, Pa., January 10, 1966.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Reading list panels

Pursuant to paragraph 4, USAWC Memorandum 28-1, dated 28 June 1963, the Reading List Panel to select books to be recommended for inclusion in the USAWC Reading List and the Department of the Army Contemporary Military Reading List is appointed to meet at the call of the chairman. The panel will be constituted as follows:

Lt. Col. W. I. Gordon, ODI&R, Chairman.
Col. R. B. Rigg, USACDCIAS, Member.
Col. R. K. Jones, DEPMILPLNG, Member.
Col. D. S. Bussey, DEPSTRATAPRSL, Member.

Mr. A. J. Blanchard, Library, Member.
For the Commandant:

WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER,
Colonel, Artillery,
Secretary.

Distribution: Z.

THE UNITED NATIONS: THREAT TO SOVEREIGNTY?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Legislative Commission To Preserve the Peace has recently compiled a study and commentary on the possible threat posed by the United Nations Organization.

An informed people are the greatest bulwark against tyranny and oppression and despotism, and I feel our colleagues will find the Alabama study both alarming and informative.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the complete text of the study and commentary in the body of the RECORD:

¹ This memorandum supersedes USAWC Memo 350-2, 19 May 1964. Last series for 1965.

THE UNITED NATIONS: THREAT TO SOVEREIGNTY?

(A Study and Commentary by the Alabama Legislative Commission To Preserve the Peace, submitted August 1967, to Alabama Legislature)

Commission members: Senator John H. Hawkins, Jr., Chairman; Representative Ira D. Pruitt, Vice-Chairman; Senator James S. Clark; Representative W. M. (Monty) Collins; Representative Robert C. (Bob) Gafford; Edwin Strickland, Staff Director.

FOREWORD

The Legislature of Alabama, in its 1966 Regular Session, directed that a study be made by the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace into the possible threat posed by the United Nations, its charter and its operation, against the sovereignty of the State of Alabama and of the United States.

Pursuant to this directive, we have utilized all sources and research material available to us in assessment of this threat.

When the United Nations was organized in San Francisco in 1945, following the close of World War II, the American people, tired of conflict, accepted its promise as an instrument of peace. Few people realized at that time that much of the pre-planning for this meeting was done in Moscow, Russia, or that an American traitor, Alger Hiss, was the chief American architect of this proposed super government.

During the years more and more American citizens, including military leaders, members of congress and persons charged with the security of this nation, have become acutely aware of the threat of the United Nations to the sovereignty and security of this country. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has warned repeatedly that we are embracing upon our shores a wellspring of espionage. Repeatedly our government has unearthed spy and espionage rings operating out of the United Nations headquarters in New York. Yet, since these delegates from communist countries enjoy full diplomatic immunity, we can do little except to declare persona non grata those who are apprehended, and to allow them to be replaced by equally well trained communist agents.

Taxpayers of the United States have been placed in the frustrating position of bearing approximately one half the expenses of the U.N. and its various interlocking agencies, while communist countries press for more and more control over American freedoms through exercise of the various charter provisions which supersede our own laws and even constitutional provisions.

We began with the deck stacked against us. As a "have" nation, we stood to lose more, materially, than other U.N. members. As a nation with a proud heritage of freedom, we stood to lose these freedoms while the people of slave nations could not lose what they did not possess.

Today we see most of the members of the U.N. arrayed against the free nations of South Africa and Rhodesia. The United Nations, a "peace" organization, has even planned the invasion of The Republic of South Africa, using American military power and troops. This plan was set forth in detail in what has become known as the "Rand Report" paid for by the Carnegie Foundation.

The influx of "emerging nations" into U.N. membership in recent years has weighted the voting power heavily in favor of communist bloc nations. These unstable nations of Africa look with envy and greed at South Africa and Rhodesia, among the few stable, self-sustaining nations left in that part of the world. The sin of these nations, in the eyes of the U.N., is that they will not submit to takeover by unqualified Negro majorities. Fresh in the minds of alert Americans is

the United Nations fiasco in South Korea, where American troops were under the overall supervision of a Soviet national acting in his United Nations capacity. This was the only war ever fought by American forces in which we were not allowed to bring about military victory, but forced to settle on a communist compromise.

As will be developed in this study. The United States has allowed many of its internal policies, including its racial problems to be dictated by the United Nations Charter.

The threat to the sovereignty of our nation and to the several states of which it is comprised is becoming widely known. And with this knowledge, freedom loving Americans are mounting a determined counter attack upon the source of this threat—The United Nations.

In the interest of brevity in this study, we have refrained from lengthy documentation on many points raised. Source material is available in the office of this Commission Room 332, State Capitol Building.

We claim no expertise on the subject of the United Nations, but we have used the studies from many sources. Special thanks should be extended to Major Arch E. Roberts both for his personal help and the valuable background of documentation contained in his authoritative book, *Victory Denied*.—Edwin Strickland, Staff Director, Alabama Legislative Commission To Preserve the Peace.

UNITED NATIONS—ITS ORIGIN

On April 26, 1945, representatives of most of the civilized nations of the world met in San Francisco to create an organization of nations which would become a pattern for world government and—it was hoped by its sincere supporters—insure lasting peace to a world long weary of war. The conference was completed on June 26, 1945, with the adoption of the UN Charter.

Before the San Francisco convention, however, much groundwork had been done by various groups in the United States and elsewhere, designed to make the world organization acceptable to the United States, which had, after World War I, rejected membership in the League of Nations.

For a period of approximately three years before the actual formation of the United Nations, there was conducted in the United States a full-blown, expensive campaign to overcome the natural objections of a free and powerful nation to giving up of its national sovereignty.

In 1941, there was organized a group called the International Free World Association, and this group began publishing a magazine called *Free World*. The secretary of this group was Louis Dolivet, who was later identified in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by Louis Budenz as a member of the Communist Party. (see IPR Hearings, 1951-52, P. 562.) Budenz was a high Communist Party functionary who defected and gave valuable testimony to the U.S. Government concerning communist spy networks in America.

The fact that the United Nations was envisioned by its planners as a world government, superseding the sovereignty of nations, was not hidden. On Aug. 6, 1946, the Chicago Tribune published an article concerning the one-world plans of the UN, and headed it "Radicals, Rich Unite To Push World State; Flight Defenders of U.S. Sovereignty."

The Council on Foreign Relations, in conjunction with the U.S. State Department, played an important role in the "conditioning" of the U.S. Congress and public to accept the UN Charter and its restrictions on national sovereignty. This is set out in State Department Publication 3580 (1950) on P. 108. This Subcommittee on International Organization was headed by Sumner Welles, of the State Department. Proving the direct

link between the old League of Nations and the United Nations, was the fact that two members of this subcommittee had also served on the staff of Col. E. M. House at the Paris Peace Conference in 1918, at the time of the founding of the League of Nations. They were Dr. James T. Shotwell and Isaiah Bowman.

Before the San Francisco Conference, preliminary meetings were held in Moscow, Russia, in October, 1943, to lay groundwork for the United Nations. The Moscow Conference was attended by the top diplomats of the United States, Russia, Great Britain and by the Chinese Ambassador to Russia. This meeting was held under the cold, calculating eye of Joseph Stalin, and received his blessing.

Later, at Dumbarton Oaks, final plans for the United Nations organization were hammered out. The chief planner at this conference, and later a top aide at the United Nations Convention, was Alger Hiss, who was later to be exposed and convicted as a Soviet spy working inside the U.S. Government.

To fully understand the planning behind the United Nations prior to 1945, we should look more closely at the Free World Association, which had such close ties to our own State Department. The organization, through its publication, *Free World*, made no effort to hide the fact that they were planning a world organization, with powers to enforce international decrees, and that the sovereignty of nations could no longer be allowed to stand in the way of this lofty goal.

One of those most active in the Free World Association was Carlo Emanuel A. Prato, who was a member of the International Editorial Board of *Free World*.

For background on Mr. Prato, we quote from the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 11, 1950, page A5016:

"Associated in the OWI Division under control of Alan Cranston was an alleged Italian Communist, Carlo Emanuel A. Prato, who had been expelled from Switzerland as a Soviet agent, entered the United States on a Czech passport issued to Milan Janota."

An ad in *Free World*, August, 1945, made the following statement:

"This month marks the *Free World's* fourth anniversary. Its first objective—a charter for world organization—is realized. Now we move on toward broader world democracy."

The objectives of the Free World Organization was set out as early as October, 1942, in its publication:

"The creation of the machinery for a world government in which the United Nations will serve as a nucleus is a necessary task of the present in order to prepare in time the foundations for a future world order."

Following the formation of the United Nations, and continuing right up until today, numerous ultra liberal and "left" organizations have been organized around the promotion and defense of the United Nations. One of the earliest of these was United World Federalists, formed on Feb. 22, 1947, by merger of several other organizations interested in world government. These merged groups were Americans United for World Government; World Federalists; Massachusetts Committee for World Federation; Student Federalists; World Citizens of Georgia and World Republic. (N.Y. Times, Feb. 23, 1947, P. 25)

Their statement quoted at that time included the following:

"... World peace can be created and maintained only under world law, universal and strong enough to prevent armed conflict between nations ... Therefore, while endorsing the efforts of the United Nations to bring about a world community favorable to peace, we will work primarily to strengthen the United Nations into a world government of limited powers adequate to prevent a war

and having direct jurisdiction over the individual." (Italics added).

The frankness with which the proponents of one-world government discussed their plans, alarmed many Americans who objected to surrendering our sovereignty, and even the basic right to defend ourselves.

In 1953 the move was made by the UN forces when the World Federal Government Conference met in Copenhagen, and recommended a revision of the UN Charter to provide for the following:

1. That the United Nations be made into a World Federal Government.
2. That there must be universal membership.
3. No right of secession.
4. Complete and simultaneous disarmament, enforced by UN inspection and UN police powers.
5. International courts, world legislature, world executive Council be established.
6. World citizenship through UN Membership, with world law applicable to individuals.

These proposals, if adopted, would have removed all traces of national sovereignty and, by definition, the sovereignty of member states. Implicit with this proposal was the power of taxation of the individual by a world legislature dominated by have-not nations envious of the great wealth and industry of the United States, where resides only six percent of the world population, but which controls half the world wealth and production capacity.

In 1954 another similar conference was held in London by a group known as World Movement for World Federation. Similar proposals were made. The membership and makeup of these two conferences indicated that they were being given considerable weight in official U.S. circles.

It was these blatant movements to end national sovereignty that caused Senator John Bricker to propose his "Bricker Amendment," which would have written into the U.S. Constitution the safeguards against our making of treaties which would bring about world government through treaty law.

The Bricker Amendment, after a long battle, fell just one vote short of receiving the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate.

Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, wrote of the Bricker Amendment:

"The Amendment is designed to write clearly into the Constitution the simple proposition that treaties and executive agreements shall not make domestic law for the people of this country except by congressional legislation within the constitutional power of the Congress. Then no State Department, now or in the future, would be able, by an international agreement, to authorize or permit the representatives of other nations to have a voice in our domestic affairs and initiate changes in our basic rights as protected by our own Constitution and Bill of Rights."

Holman warned of the dangers inherent in the defeat of the Bricker Amendment in the following terms:

"We must never forget that the issue involved in the Bricker Amendment is the greatest issue which faces America today ... The Bricker Amendment is a Bill of Rights against uncontrolled 'treaty power.' The issue is the basic issue of whether we and our children are to have a government of men or a government of adequate constitutional safeguards ..."

Of course the Bricker Amendment was fought by all the "one-world" organizations and the "internationalists" in and out of government. Among those high in our federal government who led the fight were U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, Sen. Ralph Flanders (R. Vt.), Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D. Minn.), John J. McCloy, former assistant Secretary of War and former

High Commissioner to Germany; Paul G. Hoffman, of the State Department, Thomas K. Finletter, and many others.

Prior to the introduction of the Bricker Amendment, a joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives, and passed, having the following wording:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate Concurring) that it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation, open to all nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law." (italics added.) (CONG. RECORD, June 7, 1949, p. 7356-7.)

It is significant that this resolution, which was sponsored by many of the House liberals, called for acceptance of the United Nations as a proper body to make international law, interpret international law, and enforce, international law.

By February, 1950, the stampede was on by congressmen who had endorsed the world government resolution, to revoke such endorsement. They had heard from an irate public back home.

Rep. Bernard W. Kearney (R. N.Y.) called a meeting of the sponsors of HCR 64, and made the following statement:

"We signed the resolution believing we were sponsoring a movement to set up a stronger power within the United Nations for world peace.

"Then we learned that various organizations were working on state legislatures and on peace movements for world government action under which the entire U.S. Government would be submerged in a super world government.

"Perhaps we should have read the fine print in the first place. We do not intend to continue in the role of sponsors of any movement which undermine U.S. sovereignty. Many other congressmen feel as I do. We will make our position thoroughly clear."

Rep. Kearney had reference to the fact that the world government advocates had gone to the various state legislatures and induced many of them to follow the Congressional resolution, endorsing the UN as a vehicle for world government. A total of 23 states had responded.

Within two years, 18 of the states which had passed the resolution, had rescinded it.

By this time we had gone through the Korean War, in which Russia, a member of the United Nations, had directed a war of aggression against South Korea, and against American and United Nations forces defending South Korea. This was a bizarre and sobering experience for many Americans. They saw the United Nations (largely represented by U.S. forces) engaged in fighting communist aggressors, while the United Nations machinery having direct involvement in the war was under control of a Russian national, and Russia was aiding the communist aggressor forces.

On May 15, 1954, the U.S. Defense Department released an official statement of Russian involvement in Korea. This statement was summarized by U.S. News & World Report (5-28-54) as follows:

"It is the evidence of direct Russian participation in the Korean War . . . It shows, in detail, how Russians planned the Korean attack, built up the forces required, ordered the assault, then directed the communist forces in action . . . you get the evidence, too, of more than 10,000 soldiers and vast stocks of Russian arms used in that 'non-Russian' war."

We have examined in some degree how the communist influence exerted by such persons as Hiss, Lovell and Carlo A. Prato, was dominant in the thinking and planning of the

United Nations. Other State Department planners with established communist links, such as Phillip Jessup and Dean Acheson, were of nearly equal importance. (Phillip Jessup now sits on the UN World Court as the American representative.)

It is important at this point to show that the American people really had no choice in accepting or rejecting our role in the United Nations.

Dr. James T. Shotwell, another left-leaner, admitted in his book, *An Autobiography* (Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1961), that it was he who in 1939 set up a group called a Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. He said there were 100 members of the group who met in small committees to study the question.

"This work was, naturally, well known to the State Department. When it set up a small committee with Sumner Welles, the Under-Secretary of State, as chairman to draft a post-war policy, both Clark Eichelberger, of the League of Nations Association, and I were invited to serve on it."

The result of this committee's work, with few revisions, became the Charter of the United Nations, Shotwell said.

But to show how closely it was coordinated with communist world leaders, we again quote:

"The work of the planning committee of the State Department was kept secret until finally, at a conference of foreign ministers in Moscow in November, 1943, Secretary Hull secured the consent of Stalin to establish a general organization . . . for the maintenance of international peace and security."

This agreement with Stalin resulted in the San Francisco meeting in April, 1945, to draft the UN Charter. That, supposedly, was the beginning of the United Nations. But in a State Department publication, No. 3580, released February, 1950, we find the following references to the United Nations, which supposedly was yet to be born. The report was from the first meeting of an Advisory Committee on Post-War Foreign Policy held February 12, 1942, in the office of Sumner Welles.

"Thought was given to the possibility of informing the public immediately of the establishment and work of the committee. It was felt that the circumstances at the moment, when the United States was being driven back in the Pacific and the United Nations cause was suffering on every front, rendered secrecy imperative until a favorable turn in the war . . ."

The work of the subcommittee referred to, the report revealed, established that an international organization should be set up during the war to be ready when needed to create a world political organization.

The political subcommittee which worked out these details was discussed in the report:

"Its discussions throughout were founded upon belief in unqualified victory by the United Nations. (Italics ours) It predicted, as an absolute prerequisite for world peace, the continuing strength of the United Nations through unbroken cooperation after the war."

The United Nations was created with a Security Council consisting of 11 members, which has veto power. The five permanent members are the United States, Russia, France, United Kingdom and China. The membership in the other six places is rotated.

A General Assembly of the UN constitutes the other main organ of the organization itself. It is comprised of all the members of the United Nations in good standing, and has no enforcement powers.

The UN, however, quickly set up many specialized agencies to work under U.N. banners in all member countries and in almost every field of human endeavor. Some of the major subsidiary organizations are:

The World Health Organization; The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; The World Court of Justice; The United Nations International Childrens Emergency Fund; The Economic and Social Council; The Commission on Human Rights; International Labor Organization; Commission on the Status of Women, and many, many others. Subcommittees of these committees are formed in great proliferation. It gives the UN the machinery to interfere or interject its influence into the affairs of any member nation.

One of the most important departments of the United Nations itself is the Department of Political and Security Affairs, a part of the UN Secretariat, and the head of this is appointed by the Secretary-General.

In a letter dated June 24, 1966, the United Nations described the duties of this department thusly:

"This Department provides such services as are required by the Security Council and its subsidiary organs, the Political Committee of the general assembly, the Disarmament Commission, and other bodies set up to deal with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. This includes issuing documentation required, providing secretariat services during meetings, and drafting the annual report. The Department may also prepare memoranda to assist the Secretary-General or in pursuance of resolutions of the United Nations organs.

The post of the Under-Secretary for political and Security Council Affairs has been held by the following people:

1946-49	Arkady Sobolev (USSR)
1949-53	Constantine Zinchenko (USSR)
1953-54	Ilya Tcheraychev (USSR)
1954-57	Dragoslav Protitch (Yugoslavia)
1957-60	Anatoly Dobrynin (USSR)
1960-62	George Arkadev (USSR)
1962-63	E. D. Kiselev (USSR)
1963-65	V. P. Suslov (USSR)
1965-67	A. E. Nesterenko (USSR)

Thus, during the Korean War, when the United States was fighting under UN banners in Korea against Russia aggression, the United Nations official in command of military affairs was Constantine Zinchenko, of Russia.

This same department, under Suslov, a Russian, and currently under Nesterenko, a Russian, has been and is in control of present UN plans to overthrow the established government of Rhodesia. This department served as "advisor" to plans set forth in the Rand Report, financed by the tax-exempt Carnegie Foundation. The Rand Report, which will be further discussed, is a plan for UN action, using American and Russian forces as a requisite, to militarily invade South Africa to overthrow the constituted government of this member nation.

It should be noted that the under-secretary in charge of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs has, in all cases except one, been a Russian national. In that single exception, he was a communist national of Yugoslavia. This is not by accident. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld revealed that his hands were tied by an agreement between Russia and the American planners, granting Russia the permanent right to name the person who should hold this important post.

With this agreement in effect, and with the precedent set in an unbroken line, Russia would, in effect, have complete control over any military planning and military operation of forces put under UN Command.

Article 25, of the UN Charter carries the authority to force members to obey decisions of the Security Council. It reads:

"The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter."

Article 26 reads:

"In order to promote the establishment

and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments."

Here, again, we see the strategic position occupied by Russia under its agreement to permanently name the chief of the UN Staff for military operations.

Articles 41 through 51, reproduced below, deal with action that the UN may take against any nation, whether member or not, to enforce its decrees and policies. This may consist of measures short of war, such as withdrawal of diplomatic relations, economic relations, even postal, radio, air service, sea, rail or telegraphic contact by UN Members with such a quarantined nation. (This has currently been applied, with some modifications, to Rhodesia.)

The next step authorized is the use of military demonstrations, blockade, etc., of the target nation.

Articles 43 through 45 require member nations to furnish military forces to be used against such nation, under UN command.

Article 48 gives the UN the power to select which nations may be ordered to furnish armed might, and how much.

Article 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Article 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

Article 43

1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional process.

Article 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

Article 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 47

1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.

3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.

4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional subcommittees.

Article 48

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

Article 49

The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

Article 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Article 51

Nothing in the present Chapter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Articles 52 through 54 deals with regional agreements, such as NATO, SEATO and Organization of American States, and places

them under UN authority, and makes them available, at UN command, to be used in enforcing UN policy.

Our operation in Vietnam is under our SEATO commitment, therefore, under UN Charter control.

Chapter VIII—Regional arrangements

Article 52

1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

2. The Members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

4. This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35.

Article 53

1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement agencies shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against any enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this Article, provided for pursuant to Article 107 or in regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of any such state, until such time as the Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by such a state.

2. The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this Article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter.

Article 54

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Chapter IX and Chapter X of the Charter deal with internal affairs of member nations, and their provisions may be invoked by a majority of the members of the General Assembly present and voting. (There is no veto provision in the General Assembly, which is presently dominated by the havenot, emerging nations and weighted heavily against the United States.)

Under these sections, the UN is given authority to enforce domestic policy dealing with equal employment, human rights, economic development, cultural matters and matters relating to health. It is under these sections that many specialized agencies have been set up, and their policies dealing with many domestic matters have been enacted into law in the United States after first having been pronounced by the agencies of the United Nations.

Chapter IX—International economic and social cooperation

Article 55

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the

principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

(a) higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

(b) solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

(c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 56

All Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

Article 57

1. The various specialized agencies, established by intergovernmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities, as defined in their basic instruments, in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields, shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of Article 63.

2. Such agencies thus brought into relationship with the United Nations are hereinafter referred to as specialized agencies.

Article 58

The Organization shall make recommendations for the coordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies.

Article 59

The Organization shall, where appropriate, initiate negotiations among the states concerned for the creation of any new specialized agencies required for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

Article 60

Responsibility for the discharge of the functions of the Organization set forth in this Chapter shall be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in the Economic and Social Council, which shall have for this purpose the powers set forth in Chapter X.

Chapter X—The Economics and Social Council

Composition

Article 61

1. The Economic and Social Council shall consist of eighteen Members of the United Nations elected by the General Assembly.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, six members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of three years. A retiring member shall be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. At the first election, eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council shall be chosen. The term of office of six members so chosen shall expire at the end of one year, and of six other members at the end of two years in accordance with arrangements made by the General Assembly.

4. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one representative.

Functions and powers

Article 62

1. The Economic and Social Council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations with respect to any such matters to the General Assembly, to the Members of the United Nations, and to the specialized agencies concerned.

2. It may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

3. It may prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly, with respect to matters falling within its competence.

4. It may call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the United Nations, international conferences on matters falling within its competence.

Article 63

1. The Economic and Social Council may enter into agreements with any of the agencies referred to in Article 57, defining the terms on which the agency concerned shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations. Such agreements shall be subject to approval by the General Assembly.

2. It may coordinate the activities of the specialized agencies through consultation with and recommendations to such agencies and through recommendations to the General Assembly and to the Members of the United Nations.

Article 64

1. The Economic and Social Council may take appropriate steps to obtain regular reports from the specialized agencies. It may make arrangements with the Members of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies to obtain reports on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations and to recommendations on matters falling within its competence made by the General Assembly.

2. It may communicate its observations on these reports to the General Assembly.

Article 65

The Economic and Social Council may furnish information to the Security Council and shall assist the Security Council upon its request.

Article 66

1. The Economic and Social Council shall perform such functions as fall within its competence in connection with carrying out of the recommendations of the General Assembly.

2. It may, with the approval of the General Assembly, perform services at the request of Members of the United Nations and at the request of specialized agencies.

3. It shall perform such other functions as are specified elsewhere in the present Charter or as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

In this connection we point out that the fact that the year 1968 has been designated by UN resolution, as the International Year for Human Rights.

Under this noble sounding purpose, the resolution proposes to:

1. Abolish all racial discrimination.

2. Abolish right to work laws (in effect) under resolutions adopted by the International Labor Organization.

3. Deal with the Status of women.

4. Urge all governments to review their own laws and policies and bring them into conformity with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the UN.

5. Elimination of apartheid, and all forms of discrimination in education.

6. Use the medium of press, radio, movies and the performing arts in a mass propaganda assault upon any practices not in line with UN pronouncement.

This was set forth in detail by Hon. John R. Rarick, (D. La) on March 20, 1967, (Daily Cong. Record, March 20, 1967, p. A1386-89)

In his opening remarks, Rep. Rarick titled his speech "Target Date for Subjugation: 1968."

"Mr. Speaker, many taxpayers, constituents puzzled businessmen and concerned parents are writing inquiries asking why all the emphasis is being placed on 1968 as a must year for forceful compliance with every guideline, edict, and program to regulate our lives, our businesses, our unions, and our children's futures, our manner of worship in this country.

"So that all may know and remember the source of the pressure and the cause, I am asking that the international blueprint, that is, the UN resolution—'International Year For Human Rights', designating the year 1968 as the International Year—be printed en toto in the Record, with this question: Must the Governments of South Rhodesia and South Africa be overthrown before the end of 1968?"

To indicate, further, to what degree the United States has imperiled its own sovereignty and emasculated its own power, we have but to look at the hearings conducted by the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee in March, 1954, on the *Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations*.

These United States citizens referred to in this report virtually thumbed their noses at their own government, even after the communist party affiliations of many of them were disclosed. The U.S. demanded that they be fired by the United Nations. The Secretary General did fire many of them on the complaint and evidence furnished by the United States, but a judicial body of the U.N. overturned every one of the dismissals that was based upon communist affiliations, and held that the U.S. had no power to inquire into the political beliefs of employees of the United Nations even though they were United States citizens.

This action was taken despite the fact that almost half of the financial support of the United Nations is furnished by the United States, and in spite of the further fact that the United Nations headquarters is located on United States soil.

Through the medium of the United Nations, Russia has benefited to a greater degree than any nation. This is evident by the fact that the United States government, following an unbroken line of appeasement, has continued to give economic aid to the Soviets, and her satellites, even while we are engaged in serious confrontation in Berlin, in Cuba, in Vietnam and in scores of other places in South America, Asia and Africa. We have bolstered the Russian economy by furnishing wheat to Russia, while that country was aiding Cuba with shipping food and machinery; we continue our foreign aid programs to Russian-dominated nations in Europe, thereby alleviating pressure which would be exerted on the struggling Russian economy.

The United States challenged Russia and France in the UN Security Council, for failing to pay "peace-keeping" assessments in the Congo. All during the 1964-65 session the U.S. stood firm under article 19, against allowing Russia to vote. Then came ambassador Goldberg and capitulation. After admitting defeat, and wallowing in humility, the United States again gave in to Russia. It is reliably reported out of Washington that the United States is merely waiting for an opportune time to make up the UN deficit by a large "voluntary contribution."

All this degradation of the United States is "official policy" in Washington despite the fact that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, and several congressmen, have continued to warn that we harbour in this country a well-spring of subversion in the hundreds of Communists and pro-Communist delegates at the UN.

With unbecoming audacity—and in light of the still unpaid "peace-keeping" bills incurred while trying to overthrow Tshombe, of the Congo (one of the few pro-Western African leaders), the U.N. is now putting out unofficial feelers aimed toward the military subjugation of anti-Communist South Africa. This feeler was in the form of a study prepared under the auspices of The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (It might be noted that while this tax exempt foundation is not an official appendage of the United Nations, it is headquartered at the United Nations Plaza, 46 St. New York, N.Y.)

The study, edited and largely written by Amelia C. Leiss, is called *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures*, published in March, 1965.

In the foreword to this amazing tome, the editor professes a long history of interest in the United Nations on the part of the Carnegie Foundation.

In the concluding chapter, though professing to recommend no course of action, the author discusses in great detail the naval, air and ground forces estimated to be necessary for the military subjugation of The Republic of South Africa, a stable nation and, incidentally, a dues-paying member of the United Nations. Adding another ironic touch the editor credited Major Sam C. Sarkesian, Department of Social Science, U.S. Military Academy, with assisting on the chapter dealing with military measures.

This brings up a delicate point of order: Should an officer of the United States military forces engage in plans for a military invasion of a friendly nation on behalf of an "unofficial" study group?

The United Nations has not limited its activities to international issues but has insinuated itself even into the internal affairs of sovereign states of the United States. One such incidence was on the occasion of the Selma-to-Montgomery Civil Rights march in the Spring of 1965. An official of the United Nations, Ralph Bunche, participated in the march and the banner of the United Nations was carried at the head of this rag-tag parade which featured many known communists and fellow travelers. Bunche also launched a verbal attack on Alabama and on the governor of Alabama in addressing the mob in front of the Alabama State capitol.

The head of the United Nations was much in evidence in the shaping of the 1964 Civil Rights law. This was purely internal legislative matter, but this did not deter this international group of social architects from intervening.

This thinking is reflected in the Carnegie Endowment study previously referred to. On page 159 of this study the author observes: "Nevertheless the question must be asked: what will be the impact on the capacity of the United Nations to grow and to enhance its authority if it demonstrates that it can not only discuss and pass judgment upon a member's social system but also change it by force?"

The mere voicing of this philosophy is sinister in meaning. But when it is coupled with the avowed aim of the United Nations (i.e. to exercise a sovereignty above that of member states) it becomes more sinister. The early pronouncements and actions of Ambassador Goldberg seem to indicate that he will be more favorable to relinquishing U.S. sovereignty in specific instances, than have been any of his predecessors.

Chapter XVI, including Articles 102 through 105 of the UN Charter, are called "Miscellaneous Provisions."

In these articles the right of the UN to physically come onto or occupy the land territory of a member state, for fulfillment of its purposes is further spelled out.

This, taken together with the rights to intrude into domestic affairs, as granted under Chapter IX and X, and the proposals for the year 1968, will demonstrate to what extent the sovereignty of any local territory, or subdivision, of a member state, may be abridged by UN authority.

Chapter XVI—Miscellaneous provisions

Chapter 102

1. Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any Member of the United Nations after the present Charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it.

2. No party to any such treaty or international agreement which has not been registered in accordance with the provisions of

paragraph 1 of this Article may invoke that treaty or agreement before any organ of the United Nations.

Article 103

In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.

Article 104

The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such legal capacity as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and the fulfillment of its purposes.

Article 105

1. The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfillment of its purposes.

2. Representatives of the Members of the United Nations and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization.

3. The General Assembly may make recommendations with a view to determining the details of the application of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article or may propose conventions to the Members of the United Nations for this purpose.

By ratification of the UN Charter and by subsequent ratification by the United States of various declarations and documents of the United Nations, our government is bound under treaty law to its provisions. This includes, incidentally, the declarations on the International Year of Human Rights for 1968, which received an affirmative vote by Ambassador Goldberg.

Under this treaty law, the provisions of the United Nations Charter, and the declarations of its various specialized agencies, have application in all states and territories of the United States. State and federal courts have ruled in many cases that the UN treaty law was superior to the laws of states or of the federal government. A number of such rulings have been made in California.

We do not here treat with the authority of this legislature, or of the legislature of any state, to rescind or nullify such treaty law as ultra vires or against public policy.

We herein respectfully submit our findings in accordance with the request of the Alabama Legislature, as heretofore set out.

THE WORLD JUDICIAL THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, quite recently Dr. Arthur Larson, subsidized by tax free foundations, issued a pamphlet glorifying a world ordered under someone's law and offered questions and answers to pacify the people to set the stage for abolishing the cherished Connally Reservation of 1946.

Mr. Charles K. Pulse, attorney at law of Cincinnati, Ohio, has prepared a rebuttal to Dr. Larson's planned program which should be read and re-studied by all attorneys and scholars to understand the grave threat posed by the Larson material.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Pulse's work in the RECORD at this point for all to review:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE AND THE UNITED STATES—OR WHY THE CONNALLY RESERVATION MUST BE PRESERVED

(A rebuttal to answers of Dr. Arthur Larson, director, World Rule of Law Center, Duke University, to his own questions, by Charles K. Pulse, attorney at law)

DECLARATION OF UNITED STATES ACCEPTING COMPULSORY JURISDICTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, declare on behalf of the United States of America, under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and in accordance with the Resolution of August 2, 1946, of the Senate of the United States of America (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), that the United States of America recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning

- (a) The interpretation of a treaty;
- (b) Any question of international law;
- (c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- (d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

Provided, that this declaration shall not apply to

- (a) Disputes the solution of which the Parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or
- (b) Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States of America; or
- (c) Disputes arising under a multilateral treaty, unless (1) all parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also Parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the United States of America specially agrees to jurisdiction; and

Provided further, that this declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until the expiration of six months after notice may be given to terminate this declaration.

Done at Washington this fourteenth day of August, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

ORGANIZATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

(As prescribed in Chapter 1, Statute of the International Court of Justice)

The Statute provides that the Court shall be "composed of a body of independent judges," selected without regard to nationality, "who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices, or are jurisconsults of recognized competence in international law."

The Court consists of fifteen members, "no two of whom may be nationals of the same state," elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations, from a list of persons nominated by national groups in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and by committees appointed by governments of nations not members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. Each national "nominating committee" is instructed to consult with its own nation's highest court of justice, legal faculties and schools of law,

*The italicized portion is popularly known as the Connally Amendment.

national academies and national sections of international legal academies.

From the list thus made, the General Assembly and the Security Council, voting independently, elect by majority vote.

The term of office is nine years; the Court sits at The Hague.

PREFACE

Several months ago Dr. Arthur Larson, of World Rule of Law Center, Duke University Law School, issued a pamphlet of questions and answers on the subject "The World Court and The United States," aimed at discrediting the Connally Reservation. The questions propounded in that booklet, and the answers there provided, all point toward Dr. Larson's theme that the Connally Reservation should be rescinded.

Believing that this question is of the gravest import to the people of the United States, and to freedom cherishing people everywhere, and that the opposing view should be presented in rebuttal to Dr. Larson's answers and conclusions, we have prepared our own set of answers to his questions.

In this pamphlet, which we call a rebuttal to Dr. Larson, the questions taken verbatim from the Duke University pamphlet are here set forth in italic type, followed by our answers, which are annotated. This work is meant for Americans generally, but especially for those who have had access to Dr. Larson's booklet.

1. What is the issue?

The issue is whether the United States of America should waive its national sovereignty and its blood-bought, cherished independence, not simply in "questions of international law and treaties" but in all fields of international affairs, and in a dangerously expanding field of domestic affairs affecting the peace, welfare and security of its citizens; and ultimately, accept in exchange the internationally imposed authority of a "world government." That is the issue.

Shall the United States of America become simply a province, an inferior member of a supreme world state?

Shall the flag of the United Nations, or of some other worldwide entity be flown above, or to the exclusion of the Stars and Stripes?

Shall the people of the United States of America retain the right to make and interpret their own domestic laws and govern their own lives, or shall that right be surrendered to an international body?

There is but one issue; but the connotations of that issue are infinite.

2. What is the "Connally amendment"?

The Connally Amendment (or Reservation) is a thin small line of words protecting the rights and liberties of 185,000,000 American citizens and of future generations of Americans.²

¹ "It is essentially a battle between those who want to retain our independent nationality under our Constitution and the internationalists who want a world government and in order to accomplish their purpose are willing to tear down our Constitution and surrender our sovereignty." From the Connally Reservation and The International Court of Justice (World Court), by Carl Zeiss, of Woodstock, Ill.

² On August 3, 1946, by a 51 to 12 vote, the Senate of the United States wrote into the Resolution of adherence to the International Court of Justice (The World Court) eight words—"as determined by the United States of America," so that the adherence of the United States to the jurisdiction of the World Court contains the complete reservation that it "shall not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America, as determined by the United States of America." These last eight words constitute the "Connally Reservation."

3. How would the relevant parts of the United States' declaration read if the Connally amendment were omitted?

Stress is laid, of course, by the opponents of the Connally Reservation, upon that portion of the declaration of adherence to the World Court reading as follows (the Connally Amendment omitted):

"Provided that this declaration shall not apply to . . . (b) Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America; . . ."

The claim is that the domestic jurisdiction of the United States is still protected by the emasculated declaration.³ That is not true.

The term "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" is an indefinite term, and cannot be relied on to protect American liberties.⁴

To assume that the World Court will consistently construe this phrase in such a manner as to protect the American citizen is to ignore the essential make up of the Court, composed of fourteen of its fifteen "judges" chosen from countries (excepting the United Kingdom and Australia, who may not always have representation on the Court)⁵ whose concepts of human freedom spring from the idea that the individual lives for the state, and derives his rights and freedom from the state; whereas our conception of freedom and government springs from the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence—

"That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;"

4. What is the main effect of the Connally amendment?

"It is the only real safeguard . . . we have against that school of internationalists who believe it honest and necessary for world peace to circumvent and distort the language and intentions of the Charter [United Nations Charter, Article 2(17)] with respect to the sovereignty and independence and the domestic affairs of the United States." Holman, Frank E.—"Statement of Views Regarding the Retention or Withdrawal of the Connally Reservation." (Privately printed, 1960.)

(Mr. Holman is a past President of the American Bar Association; recipient of the American Bar Association Gold Medal Award, 1953, for conspicuous service in the field of American Jurisprudence, and of many honors and awards for Distinguished Service in the Legal and Academic fields and in the Interests of the United States of America. He is an outstanding leader of those patriots who are fighting to preserve the Connally Reservation.)

³ For a comprehensive argument for repeal of the Connally Reservation, see "The Facts, The Law, and The Connally Amendment," by Arthur Larson, Duke Law Journal, Volume 1961, Number 1, Winter, pages 74-119.

⁴ "International Law; an Introduction to the Law of Peace," by Kurt von Schuschnigg, Milwaukee, Wisc. 1959. (Immediate citation, page 301):

"the term lacks an exact definition; whether or not a given issue is essentially domestic is not so much a matter of law as a matter of fact, to be decided by practical standards, and, to put it bluntly, by political considerations."

⁵ For an impressive analysis of the membership of The International Court of Justice, see "The Connally Reservation and National Security," by Frank B. Ober, Past President, Maryland Bar Association, Vol. 47, ABAJ No. 1, page 63, January 1967; "The Connally Reservation and The International Court of Justice," by Carl Zeiss.

It protects the individual and national liberty and security of the people of the United States of America.

The United States has accepted jurisdiction in many cases before the World Court. The effect of the Connally Reservation is not to "prevent adjudication in any case brought before it." However, the purpose of the reservation is to enable the United States to protect its people in their domestic affairs, and when that protection is required the United States can and should rely on the Connally Reservation.

Connally repealers point to the so-called "Norwegian Loans case" as constituting a strong refutation of the wisdom of the Connally Reservation. It is argued that this decision of the World Court was a defeat for the United States.⁶ Nothing could be further from the truth. The United States had nothing to do with the Norwegian Loans case. With or without "reciprocity" the litigation involved a domestic issue vis-a-vis Norway, and Norway so declared. But Norway had no "Connally Reservation"; it therefore had to rely on the "reciprocity" objection. Had it not been for that recourse, it is possible that the ICJ would have ruled the issue to be international and not domestic, for the Permanent Court of International Justice, that was the predecessor of the present International Court of Justice, decided a similar case along that theory in the case of the Serbian and Brazilian Loans.⁷ The fact that Norway won a case that was an essentially domestic matter, not that France lost, is what irks the proponents of the unrestricted World Court.

Is there anything immoral in preserving a nation's domestic sovereignty intact? No! On the contrary, to sacrifice that sovereignty is the highest degree of immorality, just as treason is the highest degree of crime.

5. What is the World Court?

It is not a proper court at all. There is no provision for appeal. It follows no precise statutory or codified law. It is not permitted by the enabling statute to formulate a body of authoritative precedents. It has no legal method of enforcing its judgments. It is basically an arbitration tribunal set up in 1945 under the United Nations Charter for the declared purpose of settling disputes between nations that might, if not adjudicated, endanger world peace and security. It was preceded by the Permanent Court of International Justice (established in 1920), and that by the Permanent Court of Arbitration (formed in 1899).⁸

Almost from its establishment, there has been a strong and vociferous movement¹⁰ aimed at enlarging the powers of this Court to cut through the sovereignty of nations, and to reach individual persons; not only to "protect" the individual person, but also to

⁶ ICJ Reports, 1957, page 9.

⁷ Larson, page 81.

⁸ Permanent Court of International Justice Reports, Series A, Nos. 20 and 21.

⁹ von Schuschnigg, page 308 et seq.

¹⁰ Mr. Roy Willy, a member of the Sioux Falls, South Dakota Bar, prominent in the activities of the American Bar Association, and a leader in the fight to preserve the Connally Reservation, in a debate with Dr. Arthur Larson before the Cincinnati Bar Association, at Cincinnati, Ohio, October 20, 1960, declared that the International Court of Justice is not a "court," but an "agency of the United Nations."

¹¹ Proposals for Changes in the United Nations, by Francis O. Wilcox and Carl M. March, Brookings Institute, Washington, D.C. 1955 (page 390 et seq); World Peace Through World Law, by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn, Harvard University Press 1960; Blueprint for A Peaceful World, by Paul Shipman Andrews, Current History, August 1960.

prosecute and punish him for international crimes rather than for crimes against the individual's national community. These international crimes have as yet been but dimly envisaged, are not yet defined. In order to define them and codify them the world government must and will intervene in the domestic affairs of the individual person.

6. What sort of disputes have been brought to the World Court?

Only 29 cases¹¹ have been considered by the International Court of Justice since its organization in 1945. These may be roughly divided into two classes:

A. Disputes between governments and states (although in such disputes the rights of individuals are necessarily involved), e.g., fishing and maritime rights, territorial disputes, conflicting claims to specific chattel or personal property, and aerial incidents.

B. Those disputes which, although sponsored by the governments of the individuals involved,¹² yet pertain specifically to the rights, business and property of individuals and corporations.

7. How many cases has the Court dealt with?

The International Court of Justice has, since its inception in 1945, concluded but twenty-six cases.¹³ Of these, five cases have been dismissed without judgment and with no consideration by the Court of the merits of the cases, because one or more of the parties involved had not acceded to the Court's jurisdiction.

Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the USSR, Albania and Bulgaria, having consistently refused to accept the Court's jurisdiction in any way (although the USSR has a representative, or "Judge" sitting on the Court) have refused to abide by its judgments.¹⁴

Champions of the Court claim a total of sixty-seven cases decided. However, they in-

clude in that list, thirty-eight cases that were heard and decided by the predecessor Court, i.e., the Permanent Court of International Justice,¹⁵ during its twenty-five years of existence prior to 1945.

8. What law does the Court apply?

Proponents of greater latitude for the ICJ argue that it follows "International Law." This statement poses the question, "What is International Law? What constitutes International Law?"

"International Law or the Law of Nations may be defined as law regulating the intercourse of States, which does not take its origin from individual nations but from customs and international treaties, and which is considered binding upon civilized nations in their mutual relations."¹⁶

There is no body of codified International Law, except in certain relatively specialized fields, such as maritime law. What International Law there is consists of the reported decisions of such bodies as the Hague Tribunal, the Permanent Court of International Justice, the Court of International Justice, and international agreements and declarations such as the United Nations Charter, the Atlantic Charter and other multilateral international agreements.

By the terms of the special provisions of the annex to the United Nations Charter, which provides for a Court of International Justice, the World Court is admonished to recognize: "international custom," "general principles of law recognized by civilized nations," "judicial decisions of the various nations," "teachings of the most highly qualified publicists."

A realistic, careful view of the whole matter gives no possible picture of what law or what theory would be followed in deciding any given case.¹⁷

There are eight great legal systems extant

in the world today maintaining sovereignty in widely varying degrees over some two and one half billions of people, distributed among a hundred or more nations. Eight legal systems have become extinct in historical times but have left enduring influences on the existing systems.¹⁸

There can be no possible precision in evolving judicial decisions on the "vast number" of disputes envisaged by those urging repeal of the Connally Reservation and the establishment of a World Court as an unrestrained judicial body. The World Court could well become the dictatorial ruler of the world, exercising an "ad hoc" power and an unrestrained discretion. Being hailed before such a court would throw the litigant completely and entirely upon the mercies and the judgment of judges who most likely would have little or nothing in common with the litigants.

Already, before the system has gone beyond its embryonic stage, visionary plans are proposed for regional systems within the mother system.¹⁹ What an era of chaos this would engender it is only necessary to ponder on briefly to be appalled by it.²⁰

9. Does the United States stand to gain anything by repealing the Connally amendment?

No.

The United States stands to lose its independence and its national freedom by repeal.

The claim of the critics of Connally, that the United States, its citizens, its corporations and business interests are losing the opportunity and being deprived of the means of satisfaction of legal claims, is a mendacious statement, entirely unfounded.²¹

The legal satisfaction of any possible claim arising as the result of international relations must take secondary importance as regards the peace, security and liberties of the citizens of this nation.

10. What happened in the Norwegian loans case?

What did happen? Dr. Arthur Larson²² holds this case up as the scarecrow warning away all timorous souls, as a moving example of how the USA will be deprived of its legal rights by the Connally Reservation. Again we say that the argument is false.

In the Norwegian Loans case France had invoked the International Court of Justice to compel Norway to meet certain contractual obligations on Norwegian bonds. Norway accepted the Court's jurisdiction with-

¹⁸ A Panorama of the World's Legal Systems, by John Henry Wigmore, Washington, D. C., 1936.

¹⁹ World Peace Through World Law, page 335; Human Rights and World Order, by Moses Moskowitz, New York, 1958, Chapter XII, page 153 et seq.

²⁰ "The international primitive community (at present the United Nations) is not yet and probably never will be as solidly and efficiently organized as an average civilized state." von Schuschnigg, page 8.

²¹ A Clear and Present Danger to Our National Security, by Frank B. Ober, Spotlight, No. K-485-486; also see Frank B. Ober, Vol. 47 ABAJ, No. 1, January 1961, page 63; Judicial World Supremacy and the Connally Reservation, by Charles S. Collier, Vol. 47 ABAJ, No. 1, January 1961, page 68; The Connally Amendment, by Vincent F. DeCain, National Review, March 11, 1961, page 143.

"Fundamentally . . . the ultimate purpose of our foreign policy must be to protect the liberty of the people of the United States. . . . To achieve that liberty we have gone to war, and to protect it we would go to war again. Only second to liberty is the maintenance of peace." From A Foreign Policy for Americans, by Robert A. Taft, New York 1951, page 11.

²² The Facts, the Law, etc., by Arthur Larson, page 81.

¹¹ Larson, pages 76-77 (Dr. Larson lists certain cases as being two contentious matters, whereas others consider them as but one).

The International Court of Justice: Its Compulsory Jurisdiction and Contentious Cases (Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service), by A. Luini del Russo, Legal Analyst (American Law Division), May 27, 1959.

Ober, pages 63 et seq.

von Schuschnigg, page 308 et seq.

Yearbooks, International Court of Justice.

¹² Article 34 (1) of Chapter 11, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, provides:

"1. Only states may be parties in cases before the Court."

Vol. 59, U.S. Statutes at Large, page 1055, adopted June 25, 1945, as appended to and an integral part of the United Nations Charter.

¹³ Larson counts the number of cases considered by the ICJ as 29 concluded.

¹⁴ Corfu Channel Case, ICJ Rep. 15 UK v. Albania.

Hungarian Treatment of Aircraft and Crews, ICJ Rep. 99 USA v. Hungary. Same subject and cause of action, ICJ Rep. 103 USA v. USSR. (Listed by Larson as two cases; other authorities consider these disputes to constitute one case.)

Aerial incident of March 10, 1953, ICJ Rep. 6 USA v. Czechoslovakia.

Aerial incident of October 7, 1952, ICJ Rep. 9 USA v. USSR.

Aerial incident of July 27, 1955, ICJ Rep. 146 USA v. Bulgaria. Aerial incident of July 17, 1955, ICJ Rep. 264 UK v. Bulgaria. (Listed by Larson as two cases; other authorities consider these disputes to constitute one case.)

Aerial incident of July 27, 1955, ICJ Rep. 127 Israel v. Bulgaria.

Aerial incidents of November 7, 1954, ICJ Rep. 276 USA v. USSR.

Aerial incident of September 4, 1954 (Navy Neptune Case), ICJ Rep. 158 USA v. USSR.

¹⁵ The International Court of Justice is a new organization, and not simply the continuation of the PCIJ. Wilcox and March, page 376.

¹⁶ Schuschnigg, page 3.

¹⁷ "What World Law are we talking about?" asks Harold A. Jones, in Vol. 46 ABAJ, page 1300, December 1960, in his article "World Peace Through Law, the Bedrock of the Problem."

"Article 59 of the Statute of the Court provides 'The decision of the Court has no binding force except between the parties and in respect to that particular case.' This makes it impossible for the Court to build up a body of decisions which are precedents that a nation can rely upon as established law in any particular situation. It is merely an international board of arbitration." Carl Zeiss (of Woodstock, Ill.) in "The Connally Reservation and the Clashes of the Internationalists," 1961. (A privately printed brochure.)

"Does anyone know what the phrase 'General principles of law recognized by civilized nations' means? This phrase is without possibility of present definition. What are the 'civilized nations' and what are the 'general principles of law' recognized by as many as a half dozen nations?" An International Bill of Rights, by Frank E. Holman, 34 ABAJ, page 984, November 1948.

"International law is, therefore, not law at all in the strict sense of the term. . . . It is nothing more than a generalized statement of the rules which nations have actually recognized in their treaties with one another made from time to time." From Woodrow Wilson's "The State, Elements of Historical and Practical Politics" (1890), as quoted in Proceedings of American Society of International Law, April 25, 1946, page 7.

Law to be applied by the Court:

Article 38, Statute of International Court of Justice, appended to UN Charter.

Holman, Frank E. Pamphlet, 1960. Elizabeth Chesnut Barnes, DAR Magazine, April 1960, page 288.

out reservation. France had a reservation similar to the Connally Reservation.

Norway answered to the suit (1) that the matter was completely within the domestic jurisdiction of Norway, and therefore under Article 2 (7) of the Charter of the United Nations was not within the jurisdiction of the Court; and (2) that since France retained the right to deny jurisdiction in domestic matters, Norway, by reciprocity, had the same right. The Court held for Norway on the latter ground.

Actually this case should be considered as justification for the retention of the Connally Reservation.

11. *Would Norway have won the Norwegian loans case anyway, on the ground that the issue was in fact domestic?*

It should have, under the terms of Norway's acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction, and the structures of Article 2(7) of the UN Charter.

We are reminded of the dollar devaluation cases decided by the United States Supreme Court in the 1930's. The Supreme Court ruled that bonds and mortgages issued in the United States, "in the absence of any claim of international rights based upon the treaty provision of the constitution," were "domestic obligations to be interpreted and enforced according to the law of the country."²³

Norway's mode of payment of the bonds, as a consequence of Norway's going off the gold standard, was strictly a domestic matter.

The right to determine its own fiscal and monetary policies is indispensable to a nation's independence.²⁴

12. *Did France have any other remedy?*

It is inconceivable that France and Norway could not in some way resolve their differences. The channels of diplomatic settlement are always open.

The great, emotional argument of the World Court enthusiasts is that it must have unlimited jurisdiction in order to prevent war.

Should Americans sacrifice their safeguards against tyranny and usurpation of power simply to allow some unknown bondholders to litigate with greater facility?

13. *What countries have made declarations recognizing the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court?*

First, there is a distinction in the acceptances. The distinction lies between those nations accepting without substantial limitation, and those whose limitations are of consequence.

Seven nations have Connally type reservations, or reservations even broader than Connally.²⁵

²³ *Perry v. United States*, 294 United States Reports, page 263 and page 330. Other gold payments cases are reported in Vols. 294 and 307 United States Supreme Court Reports.

²⁴ See: *The Connally Resolution Should Not Be Withdrawn* (article), by Albert J. Schweppe, Vol. 46 ABAJ, page 735, July 1960.

"The trouble with this argument (of the repealer) is that it backfires, for the question of whether Norway had a right to repudiate payment of Norwegian bonds in gold appears to be a domestic matter and one for the Norwegian courts. It would seem that a nation has the right, as a domestic matter, to protect its financial stability without rendering itself internationally liable. Most nations, including our own, have indulged in repudiating gold clauses for domestic reasons."

(Mr. Schweppe is a former President of the Washington State Bar Association; a former Dean of the University of Washington Law School, a member of the American Bar Association and a prominent practicing attorney of Seattle, Washington.)

²⁵ We are indebted to the late Mr. Carl Zeiss, Route No. 1, Woodstock, Illinois, for an analysis of the World Court's membership, in his copyrighted brochure—*The Connally*

Fifteen nations have retained the privilege of withdrawing from the Court on notice of varying lengths of time, from the right of the United Kingdom to terminate on notice effective as of the time of notice, to Liechtenstein's provision for one year notice.

Other nations have special exceptions and reservations, or limited acceptances, as, e.g., the United Arab Republic accepts only as to Suez Canal matters and arrangements.

Only seven nations have no reservation in their acceptances, viz: Columbia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Panama, Uruguay, Nicaragua, and Paraguay.

It finally must be remembered that sixty-three nations have given no adherence to the World Court whatever.

14. *How many of these declarations contain self-judging clauses?*

Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Sudan, South Africa, Portugal, and the United States of America—seven countries in all, have unambiguous reservations protecting their sovereignty.

However, in addition to these, France excepts "disputes arising out of a crisis affecting the national security." Britain (the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland) reserves the right to terminate its acceptance on notice, immediately, and so do India, Australia, Israel, Liechtenstein, Pakistan and Switzerland. Honduras has accepted for "an indefinite term," which is tantamount to an "at will" acceptance. New Zealand, having first accepted for a five-year term, now continues on an "at will" basis, as also do the Philippines.²⁶

The term "self-judging" is misleading; in that it is not "self-judging" whatever that the nations have reserved, but rather to sharply and clearly spell out a vital definition of national sovereignty. Quoting Carl Zeiss (26):

"Its only effect is to foreclose the remedy of a hearing in the World Court which the plaintiff is not entitled to in any event because the case involves a matter within our domestic jurisdiction."²⁷

15. *Suppose one of the 38 countries with declarations nationalized American industries and properties without compensation. Could the United States on behalf of the American investors today bring that country into the World Court?*

Reservation and the International Court of Justice (World Court), 1961.

Ober, Vol. 47 ABAJ, No. 1, January 1961, pages 63-64.

Pamphlet: *Retain the Connally Reservation*; Questions and Answers, by John B. Gest, Esq., of Philadelphia, Penn.

²⁶ *The Connally Reservation and the Cliches of the Internationalists*, by Carl Zeiss.

²⁷ Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 7, of the Charter of the United Nations:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. . . ."

(Note)—The word "intervene" has not been authoritatively defined, nor have the words "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state." Moskowitz, pages 32-33.

And Moskowitz also maintains that: "Whether a matter is, or is not, essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a state is not necessarily a legal question. It depends upon the state of international relations at a particular time." Pages 32-33.

Withdrawal of the Connally Reservation would therefore throw the definition of these vital terms unreservedly within the discretion of the World Court. See Ober and Collier, supra.

1959-1960 Yearbook of the International Court of Justice, pages 222-257.

For a list of instruments granting special jurisdiction to the ICJ, see page 258 et seq.

The "repealers" answer this question "No" and cite the Norwegian Loans case and the Interhandel case as supporting that answer.

We have commented on the Norwegian Loans case.

In the Interhandel case the Court ruled by a divided vote, nine to six, that under Article 36, Paragraph 6, of the ICJ Statute, in spite of the Connally Reservation, it had jurisdiction.²⁸

This case had been previously litigated in the Federal Courts of the United States. The ICJ held that the litigants had not exhausted their local remedies.

The answer given by Connally "repealers" and World Court enthusiasts implies that there is no road to redress other than the ICJ.

In truth there are many other recourses, including diplomatic channels, arbitration, and frequently (as in Interhandel) the national courts of the nations involved.

The nature of the hypothetical case used as the basis for the question is such that its issues would very likely not be justifiable in any court. When nations nationalize or expropriate the properties of the nationals of other nations, the act is invariably the result of a revolutionary or other entirely political upheaval in which emotion has generated to an excessively high degree. Judicial settlement cannot in such cases avail. Only delicate and extended diplomatic negotiations can avert war and effectuate compensation or repossession.²⁹

16. *In the same case, could the United States bring the country into court, if the Connally amendment were repealed?*

The answer of the World Court champions assumes a willingness of the nations litigant to submit to World Court jurisdiction. This is not a sound assumption. Sixty-three nations have so far refrained from accepting jurisdiction in any sense. None of the "iron curtain" countries have acceded to the Court's jurisdiction in any degree, nor will they ever, including Communist China and Communist Cuba, unless the decision as to any dispute is a foregone conclusion favorable to that country.

If the issue is one that requires solution to avoid war, if the breaking out of war or the accomplishment of peace hangs on the determination of the dispute, rarely if ever will the nation losing the judgment (in the event that the World Court does consider it) accede to that judgment.³⁰

17. *As a matter of American self-interest, is the United States apt to lose more by being unable to claim as plaintiff than it gains by being able to get out of suits in which it is defendant?*

By this question the Connally repealers pose the issue as an economic matter.

Since American citizens, they argue, have some 27 billions of dollars of direct private investment in other countries, we cannot afford to deprive them of a certain and sure means of protection under the law. Let us analyze that briefly.

The means of protection, as has been pointed out, is not certain and sure.

It is true that Americans have some billions invested in other countries, both privately and governmentally. Likewise, citizens of most of the major powers or nations of the

²⁸ *Switzerland v. USA*: ICJ Rep. 11. Statute of the ICJ. Appended to the UN Charter.

²⁹ *Felix Frankfurter Reminisces*, by Dr. Harlan B. Phillips, New York 1960, page 196.

³⁰ *The Connally Reservation, Peace and Law*, by Frank W. Grinnell, Vol. 46 ABAJ, page 737, July 1960.

"The fact is well known that the Soviet Union never accepted the jurisdiction of the Court in any way, shape or form." Alexander C. Dick (in *Views of the Readers*, 46 ABAJ No. 9, page 928, Sept. 1960).

world have considerable money invested in the United States. It would be interesting to know how these investments, both of Americans in foreign nations, and of foreign investors in the United States, are divided among the adherents to the ICJ, and especially among the nations represented by their nationals on the Court itself.

In most cases brought before the ICJ in which the United States would be a party, the membership of the Court, being 14 to 1 against the USA (assuming that the USA always has a representative on the Court—which is an assailable assumption), would be “stacked” as to self-interest overwhelmingly against the USA.²¹

It would be like a lender presenting a case against a debtor-defendant before a jury composed of fourteen individuals all of whom were debtors to the lender-plaintiff. No competent trial lawyer would rely on such a jury for a fair verdict. The situation would be no less unbearable if, instead of a jury of laymen, the “jury” consisted of fourteen jurists all or a majority of whom were indebted to the plaintiff.

The great issues that make or prevent wars are never solely economic. Economics may be involved, but the issues that precipitate wars are overwhelmingly political and the ICJ in attempting to settle such problems must adopt political expedients and solutions.²²

American investors and American tourists and residents abroad are entitled to a more certain protection than that furnished by a World Court fourteen to one²³ against America and with no powers of enforcement of its judgments.

18. What is the effect of the Connally amendment under economic aid agreements?

If, as is urged by proponents of repeal of the Connally Reservation, economic aid agreements between the United States and other countries normally require a bilateral or multilateral agreement to accept jurisdiction of the World Court or some other tribunal, then such countries should be expected to abide by their agreements. If it is a binding agreement no reciprocal loophole should avail. On the other hand, provisions in any international agreement entered into by the United States of America through its executive or administrative offices that ignore the Connally Reservation are contrary to its spirit and purpose and a violation thereof, and violations of law.

The Connally Reservation protects American domestic rights under the Economic Aid agreements, and is a stumbling block only to those who, either through misguided good intentions or selfish purpose, would circumvent the fundamental domestic interests of the United States.²⁴

²¹ Ober, page 65; von Schuschnigg, pages 327-331.

²² Theory and Practice in Public International Law, by Charles De Visser, pages 328, 348, Princeton University Press 1957.

²³ The disparity could be 15 to 1, in the event a nation not represented on the Court should exercise its right under Article 31, Paragraph 2 of the Statute.

For a scholarly discussion of the effect of the Connally Reservation, see Schweppe, Vol. 46, No. 7 ABAJ, page 732, July 1960.

²⁴ Economic Cooperation Act, Aug. 13, 1948, 62 Stat. 147.

1960 Hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee on S.R. 74.

From page 198 of the 1958-59 World Court Yearbook:

“The Court’s jurisdiction is based, on the one hand, on various treaties and other instruments concluded after the Second World War, and, on the other, on some agreements and instruments concluded before 1945 and still in force today.”

Pages 199 through 333 of the 1958-59 Yearbook:

19. Have other attempts to incorporate the Connally amendment in international agreements been made?

This question as framed by Dr. Larson creates a subtle inference that the rule is the exception and the exception the rule.

The Connally Reservation is the law today, and it is the law until it is rescinded. The “attempts” that have been made vis-a-vis Connally have been and continue to be attempts to circumvent and repeal.

Many treaties have been formulated and affirmed, most of them bilateral, containing provisions avoiding the Connally Reservation.²⁵ The Law of the Sea was presented to the Senate with a Connally nullification clause in it. To this date, the attempt to bypass Connally has prevented ratification of this multilateral treaty.

The Law of the Sea Convention is that type of treaty that creates or codifies a wide field of international law. There appears to be general agreement that its provisions to the extent that they pertain to international trade, commerce and maritime matters are salutary. However, as this Convention would be almost universal in its application, the devotees of world government saw a golden opportunity in by-passing the Connally Reservation, to bring the dream of “One Worldism” nearer. That is what has held up the approval of this Convention.

One World devotees seek through the multilateral treaty and convention to set up provisions that will be considered by the ICJ and other judicial, executive and administrative bodies as systems of international law. The people of the United States are constitutionally entitled to say, through their duly elected representatives in Congress, what the laws governing the American people shall be. Approval of such treaties and conventions by the Senate alone is not the constitutional method of enacting domestic law. Neither are executive agreements.²⁶

The Connally Reservation merely spells out clearly and unambiguously a traditional

“The World Court lists documents on which its jurisdiction rests. Forty of the specific documents listed are American foreign aid agreements with other nations.” (Dan Smoot Report, Vol. 6, No. 31, August 1, 1960, page 242.)

²⁵ See Congressional Record (Senate), 86th Congress, May 26, 1960, pages 10385 and 10386, for list of 38 treaties of recent date bearing exceptions to the Connally Reservation.

Hearings on the Law of the Sea (Executive J, K, L, M, and N), Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate, 86th Congress, 2nd Session, page 79.

²⁶ Treaty Law Making: A Blank Check for Writing a New Constitution, by Frank E. Holman, Vol. 36, ABAJ, page 707, September 1950.

The United States has always claimed the right to unilaterally invoke a domestic jurisdiction reservation. “But such a right has always been claimed by the United States.” (Professor Sidney R. Jacoby, in American Journal of International Law) 1958.

The foregoing quotation appears in an article—United States Policy Regarding International Compulsory Adjudication, by Eleanor A. Finch, 46 ABAJ, page 852, August 1960.

Miss Finch states, page 854: “The Connally Reservation represents in succinct form the consistent policy of the United States as laid down by the Senate. The proposal to withdraw the reservation is essentially one to alter radically the U.S. position on the subject.”

Schweppe, supra, page 736: “The Connally Reservation is completely consistent with our foreign policy beginning with the Monroe Doctrine, namely, that the United States has consistently reserved the exclusive right to pass on what have been called in official language ‘American question.’”

American position in international relationship, consistently followed through the Republic’s history. It is not a new principle. It is not opportunistic. The honesty and clarity of the eight words of the reservation is what galls the internationalists and the one worlders.

20. If the acceptance and use of the Court were increased, could it help settle important disputes that threaten world peace?

Let us ask three counter questions:

(1) To what degree should the acceptance and use be “increased”?

(2) What standard or norm will measure the effectiveness of the Court, to the degree that it will “help settle important disputes that threaten peace”? (Emphasis supplied.)

(3) To what extent are the people of the United States willing to surrender their individual freedom and their liberty, as a pawn to secure this uncertain approach to world order?

The earnest desire of large segments of mankind to avoid war should not lead us into grievous abandonment of our own civil and political rights. That is not a selfish statement. It is common sense. It is predicated upon both national interest and long range international well being.

Any dispute that is vital enough and basic enough to cause war is not a justifiable matter. Such disputes are political and emotional conflicts.²⁷

The seven aerial incident cases brought before the ICJ but never concluded because the Communist countries will not consent to jurisdiction nor abide by a judgment prove the insufficiency of lawsuits to preserve peace. Cuba will never submit its expropriation issues to the ICJ unless Cuba is certain beforehand of a favorable decision.

21. Has the Connally reservation affected the United States’ position in the world community?

Connally repealers argue “The United States is now the only major power retaining this (self-judging) reservation.”²⁸

This statement, which is repeated and reiterated time and again by all those who in varying degrees, from out and out One Worlders, and World Federalists, to those who are just confused people, is simply not true. (See answers to questions 13 and 14.) With the Connally Reservation rescinded, in the event of an encroachment by the International Court of Justice upon the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, our nation’s alternative to meek submission or war (and that being a war against the United Nations) would be to invoke its right of veto in the Security Council, or to withdraw from the Court on six months’ notice (which

²⁷ “The crisis in international relations is a crisis of the spirit and structure of contemporary society; it can be resolved only in respect for human values. . . . There is no foundation for the international order if the international order has not provided it.” Charles de Visscher, page 122.

“All history shows that disputes which have led to wars were not legal but political in character, and therefore not ‘justiciable.’” A Clear and Present Danger to Our National Security, by Frank B. Ober, Spotlight, No. K-485-486.

“It is wishful thinking to believe that there is an easy road to peace by going further and submitting all international disputes to the World Court for decision on legal grounds.” The World Court Cannot Become a Substitute for War to Remedy Injustice, by Eustace Seligman, ABAJ, Vol. 46, No. 3, page 251, March 1960.

“At any rate, there are still disputes which are, as a rule, not susceptible of peaceful settlement by the regular methods and procedures provided by international conventions, including the UN Charter.” Schuschnigg, page 302.

²⁸ Larson Pamphlet, page 15.

action, taken after the abhorrent judgment were rendered, would likely be of no avail).³⁹

We do not need to agree with these conclusions to be warned. If we do agree with them, it is inconceivable that we should concur in the efforts to rescind or circumvent the Connally Reservation.

22. *Is there a relation between increasing judicial settlement of disputes and the prospects of disarmament?*

To a point which cannot be clearly defined or identified, the reduction of armaments and of military facilities for aggression would reduce world tensions. The formulae have never been reliable because they depend on too many imponderables. The great disruptive issues are not subjects amenable to judicial settlement.⁴⁰ This is not, however, to deny the efficiency of prayer and hope. These, plus courage, at times seem to be the individual's last resort.

However, the means and opportunities for judicial settlements are already provided. Let the International Court of Justice prove its worth within present limits. There's opportunity for it to perform its functions without asking the surrender of the final

³⁹ "Our two remaining safeguards after repeal of the Connally Amendment, namely, our right to veto the enforcement of a judgment, and our right to withdraw from the Court on six months' notice, are surely as 'self-judging' as the Connally Amendment, and would appear to be much worse in the eyes of other countries, since these actions would be taken after, rather than before, the Court assumes jurisdiction." Benjamin Wham, of the Chicago, Illinois Bar in letter to ABAJ Vol. 46, No. 11, November 1960, page 1172.

See also: Alfred J. Schweppe's remarks before the House of Delegates, American Bar Association, on page 1235 of the same issue of ABAJ.

Carl Zeiss, in his brochure "The Connally Reservation and the Cliches of the Internationalists," sums up his "veto-escape hatch" argument as follows:

"After the Connally Reservation is repealed, it would suddenly be discovered that the veto theory is unsound, that the escape hatch does not exist, that a proper construction of the Charter and the Court Statute requires the judgment defendant to abstain from voting on a decision in the Security Council in regard to enforcement of the judgment. 'Too bad! There is nothing that can be done about it now.'"

Mr. Zeiss may well have read the statement of Sir Gerald Fitzmaurice, K.C.M.G., Q.C., in *The British Yearbook of International Law*, Vol. 34, 1958, in his series of articles on "The International Court of Justice, Questions of Jurisdiction and Procedure," wherein at page 16, we find the following:

"In all these cases the 'offer' cannot be withdrawn, so far as the particular case goes once it has been accepted in the appropriate way; nor, when it is a case of a treaty obligation, can any notice terminating the general treaty obligation affect proceedings already instituted. . . . Again, a standing declaration may be terminated, cancelled, expire or not be renewed; but this cannot affect proceedings already commenced in virtue of it."

⁴⁰ "The settlement of disputes between states, is never comparable to the settlement of disputes between individuals." de Visscher, page 328.

"The most dramatic and irreconcilable conflict of present times has assumed the forms of a defensive crusade against offensive despotism. . . . To dream about the possibilities of a legal settlement through judicial procedures would be utterly unrealistic." von Schuschnigg, page 283.

"The issues that are justiciable between nations are very limited." Frankfurter Reminiscences, Phillips, page 196.

vestiges of American freedom to an extremely uncertain, well-nigh hopeless cause.

The development and codification of International Law must proceed far beyond the present stages. There are great areas untouched by any systematic legal philosophy, and fundamental differences that offer insurmountable obstacles to a world-wide legal hegemony.

You do not erect a grain elevator in a wilderness peopled only by savages. First you must tame the wilderness, then settle it with trained and orderly people; you must create a community.

Law does not create the community of man. It's the other way around—the Community of Man creates the Law.

23. *Is the Connally amendment valid under international law?*

The only serious question about this is in the minds of the Connally repealers. World Court enthusiasts argue that the bounds of the Court's jurisdiction are strictly limited by "the World Court statute and by the terms of the declarations deposited with the Court."⁴¹

Article 36 (6) of the statute is a self-judging provision:

"6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."⁴²

Yet Connally repealers are indignant at the thought of "self-judging."

Why is it good manners for the World Court to judge the limits of its own jurisdiction (with no possibility of appeal to a higher tribunal, mind you) while it is poor manners in the international set for the United States and those other nations participating under similar reservations to retain the right to judge what is domestic and what is not domestic?

However, the Connally Reservation is valid internationally, and is in accord with the historic policy of the United States.

There is no binding rule of International Law that can invalidate any act of any national legislature excepting by the act or consent of the government of the nation involved.⁴³

To argue that a national legislature cannot enact laws and limitations to preserve the nation's domestic life and entity is to argue that the nation must of necessity commit suicide. But, it is urged, the obligations under the UN Charter require the nullification of the Connally Reservation. That is not true.

"The principle of loyalty to treaty obligations neither necessitates nor justifies suicide."⁴⁴

The whole trouble about this matter arises out of misconception or ignorance of the fundamentals of American government, and, let us face the fact, in some cases reckless indifference. Under our system government derives its powers from the consent of the governed.⁴⁵ Under most systems of the world, the governed derive their liberties (such as they are) by consent of the government. Those countries where liberty is revered, where freedom approaches the degree of

⁴¹ Larson, Pamphlet, answer to Q. 23; Larson, Connally Amendment, etc., pages 75-76.

⁴² A Manual of International Law, by George Schwarzenberger, 4th Edition, N. Y. 1960, page 26.

⁴³ "A nation's jurisdiction within its own territory is 'necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself.' The nation itself must consent to any restrictions upon its 'full and complete power . . . within its own territories.'" Life of John Marshall, by Albert J. Beveridge, Vol. 4, page 122, quoting Marshall's words from "Schooner Exchange Case," 7 Cranch, page 136.

⁴⁴ See Schweppe, supra page 735.

⁴⁵ von Schuschnigg, page 264.

⁴⁶ Declaration of Independence.

freedom retained by the American citizen, are countries where the approach has been made toward, if not up to the American ideal.

Of course the Connally Reservation is valid under International Law⁴⁶ and under American law as well, which in the last analysis is the only law that should matter to an American citizen.

As von Schuschnigg points out⁴⁷ the United States is not alone in maintaining the right of self-preservation. Argentina denies that treaties may derogate national law; and the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, France and Canada require treaty provisions to be enacted as national law before their citizens shall be domestically bound thereby.

24. *If the Connally amendment is invalid, what is the effect of its invalidity?*

In the first place, the Connally Reservation is not invalid.

The World Court, as it was presented to the nations of the World who signed the United Nations Charter, was only a somewhat dressed up and advanced arbitral tribunal. Jurisdiction was to be based strictly upon consent. Unless a nation accepted its jurisdiction, that nation was not to be subject to the Court's judgments. Consequently, Russia, Bulgaria, Albania, and some sixty other nations of the world having never accepted the Court's jurisdiction are not subject to its judgments.

Acceptance of its jurisdiction could be general, specific, or general with reservations. The last option was taken by the United States and most other nations consenting to jurisdiction.

Adherence to the Court was presented to the United States Senate, and to the people of America as above described, and not as the keystone to a world government edifice.⁴⁸

The people who want to form a World Government are unhappy and frustrated. So characteristically, they can think of but one thing; that it is the United States and not the Communist nations, not the sixty-three other nations that have refrained, but the USA that is blocking their dreams. Therefore, they say, the United States should remove all obstacles on faith that the millennium will result.

The opinions of the ICJ indicative of its claims to determine its own jurisdiction is a matter of opinion only, based, it may be, upon an ad hoc declaration designated a "statute"; it may be upon a tenet of International Law for which the most to be said is that it is debatable, a self-serving opinion in that the fifteen judges on that Court thereby seek to place the mantle of an awesome power upon their shoulders.

If the ICJ is to have unlimited power, and that is what is desired by all or most World Court enthusiasts if we assume the full import of their arguments, then there will be no liberty in the world, for the World Court will be the autocrat and the ruler; and the only appeal will be to deity, God, Jehovah,

⁴⁶ "Before such a persistent affirmation of freedom of action, the Court whose competence is based exclusively upon the consent of the defending state, can only respect an essential condition of this consent and give it its full effect." Eleanor H. Finch, supra, quoting Charles de Visscher, former Judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in reference to the International case, 46 ABAJ No. 8, page 853, August 1960.

⁴⁷ von Schuschnigg, page 259. See also: Treaty Provisions in Foreign Constitutions, by Richard Young, Vol. 38 ABAJ, page 513, June 1952.

⁴⁸ de Visscher agrees that the "unreserved undertaking to submit all disputes without exception" is at present impracticable, particularly as to the great powers. de Visscher, pages 348, 351.

Allah, Buddha, Damballah, Quetzacoatl, the tree Gods of Africa, the Thunderbird of the American Indians, or the Gods that live in the seas. You will take your choice of what God you look to for relief according to your belief. If you are an atheist, or a humanist, you will have nothing to look to, nothing but the World Government.

25. *If the Connally amendment were repealed, would the International Court have jurisdiction over essentially domestic American matters?*

The proponents of World Government say "no," and go on in typical doubletalk to support their answer.

We say "the World Court will assert such jurisdiction" under the interpretations of the word "domestic" by such authorities as Jessup and Lauterpach,⁴⁹ and supported by certain unpleasantly prophetic pronouncements of our own Supreme Court⁵⁰ and of our State Department which has declared to the world: "There is no longer any real distinction between 'domestic' and 'foreign' affairs."⁵¹ Eminent students of International Law as well as of American Constitutional Law look upon the Connally Amendment as the chief present defense against such encroachment upon American liberties.⁵²

26. *Does the Court have a guiding rule of*

⁴⁹ "Professor Jessup (now a member of the World Court) has suggested that inclusion in the Charter of provisions with regard to fundamental human rights lifts these out of the reservation concerning domestic questions (art. 2, No. 7) and makes them matters of international concern." Clyde Eagleton, in *Proceedings of the American Society of Int. Law*, 1946, at page 26.

See: *A Modern Law of Nations*, by Philip C. Jessup, MacMillan, 1948, pages 40, 41, 42, for Dr. Jessup's own words.

"At this point one must be reminded of the new international interest, or meddling if you will, in matters which once were thought to be essentially domestic. Although the U.S. Government does not agree, the international movement in favor of human rights and against such specific crimes as genocide (which may be wholly territorial) has considerable support." Philip C. Jessup, *Transnational Law*, New Haven, 1956, page 51.

"The power of governments to derogate from rights of the citizens, which in the United States are considered fundamental, is a typical characteristic of United Nations treaties." *The Need to Restrain the Treaty Making Power of the United States Within Constitutional Limits*, by George A. Finch, *American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pages 57-58.

International Law and Human Rights, by Sir Hersch Lauterpach, New York, 1950.

⁵⁰ *United States v. Pink*, etc., 315 United States Reports, pages 203, 230, 231; *Oyama et al. v. California*, 332 United States Reports, pages 633, 647, 748, 673; *United States v. Belmont*, 301 United States Reports, page 324.

In the last mentioned case, at page 331, Justice Sutherland stated: "In respect of all international negotiations and compacts, and in respect of our own foreign relations generally, state lines disappear. As to such purposes the State of New York does not exist."

⁵¹ U.S. Department of State, Pub. No. 3972, *General Foreign Policy Series No. 26*, *Our Foreign Policy*, 1950. See Schweppe, *supra* page 733, etc.

⁵² *Judicial Supremacy*, etc.

Collier at page 69: "without the Connally Reservation the only principle or rule of limitation on jurisdiction of that court really will be merely the rule of discretionary self limitation."

Page 70: "The result would probably be that the World Court under the terms of its basic statute (Chapter 2, Article 36, Par. 2) would assume jurisdiction over all the domestic issues in any legal dispute where there

law to determine what matters are essentially for international or domestic jurisdiction?

No, it does not.⁵³

The norms that are supposed to guide the Court are set by Article 38 of the Statute.

Conventions and treaties are limited in number, and usually in scope. Where, in such as the draft covenant on human rights and multilateral treaties and conventions, a general field is approached, it is often done in vague terms permitting the widest variance of opinion as to the meaning and application.

Custom is only evidence of acceptable practice. "General principles of law" is an indefinite phrase.⁵⁴ Under what standards and by whose fiat are the "highly qualified publicists" chosen as authority?

Dr. Larson quotes the PCIJ in the *Tunis-Morocco* case.⁵⁵ The quotation is inadequate.

Professor Briggs⁵⁶ also cites this opinion: "The question whether a certain matter is or is not solely within the jurisdiction of a state is an essentially relative question; it depends upon the development of international relations."

In other words there is no certain reliable definition of domestic jurisdiction. Let us read further:

"Matters of domestic jurisdiction are not those which are unregulated by international law, but are those which are left by international law for regulation by States. There are, therefore, no matters which are domestic by their 'nature.' All are susceptible of international legal regulation and may become the subjects of new rules of customary law or of treaty obligations."

The only rule possible in the absence of

was a single potentially decisive issue of international law."

Page 73: "There is no effective limitation expressed or implied set forth anywhere in the controlling 'constitutional instruments' of the U.N. that even purports to limit the judicial jurisdiction of the international court with regard to any 'domestic jurisdiction' subject matters as such."

See letter of Ralph T. Catterall, of Richmond, Va., in *ABAJ*, Jan. 1961, Vol. 47, page 6.

"When it comes to the 'interpretation of a treaty' it only becomes necessary to incorporate in treaty form any matter involving our domestic affairs for the World Court to obtain jurisdiction over such matters." Holman Pamphlet, page 13.

State of Missouri v. Holland, United States Game Warden, 252 United States Reports, page 416.

Report of State Bar of Texas as cited by Barnes, *DAR* magazine, page 238, April 1960.

"The disposition of the General Assembly (of the UN) as evidenced by its decision in the *France-Algeria* matter, appears to regard every question as international."

The United Nations, *Planned Tyranny*, by V. Orvall Watts, Devin-Adair, 1955.

Page 62: Dr. Watts cites the statement of the U.S. Consultant at the San Francisco Conference, where the United Nations Charter was born, who declared that any nation signing the Charter became at once subject to the Charter and the Security Council in all its acts and domestic affairs. (Citing "One World in the Making," Boston, 1946, at page 45.)

⁵³ See answers to question 8 and annotations, *supra*.

⁵⁴ An International Bill of Rights, by Frank E. Holman, 34 *ABAJ*, page 984, November 1948, at 1078.

⁵⁵ *Tunis-Morocco Nationality Decrees*, Permanent Court of International Justice—1923, Series B, No. 4. Hudson, *World Court Reports* 1, 143.

⁵⁶ *The Law of Nations; Cases, Documents, Notes*, by Herbert W. Briggs, 2nd Edition, New York 1952, pages 24, 452.

the Connally Reservation is the rule of opportunistic ad hoc procedure and adjudication of many of the vital issues that would come before the ICJ. That is not a rule justifying surrender of American liberties.

27. *If the Connally amendment were repealed, would United States' control over raising or lowering tariffs be considered an international rather than a domestic matter?*

28. *Would immigration quotas be taken out of the control of the United States if the Connally amendment were repealed?*

29. *Would the United States' rights in the Panama Canal be endangered if the Connally amendment were repealed?*

30. *If citizens of Panama were to attempt to assert control over the canal by force (as distinguished from legal action), what legal remedy would the United States have?*

The answer of the foes of Connally is, of course, "No," as to each of the first three questions of these four.

The answers we have given to many of the preceding questions would apply with equal force to any and all of the above last four questions.

Glib reasons given to show why the ICJ would not exercise jurisdiction in these types of cases, causes us to wonder why there is so much energy expended in arguing for the broadening of the powers of the ICJ—for that is what would result by the repeal of Connally. We are supposed to believe that the ICJ is completely thwarted now, by Connally. Thwarted from what? From exercising the jurisdiction vested in it by the Charter? The jurisdiction and power to do what it is supposed to do as represented to us when the Charter was adopted? No. Of course not. The Court is thwarted, or its champions are thwarted, because the Court so far cannot do the very things they say it will not do after Connally is repealed.

Dr. Larson⁵⁷ suggests that, since much tariff policy and execution is now governed by treaties, which are subject to international law, the continuation or repeal of the Connally Reservation will make little difference to Americans. He uses a similar approach to the matters of Immigration Policy and the Panama Canal.

That prompts us to ask, why such an insistence that the Connally Reservation be repealed? Why cannot the World Court operate effectively under its present setup? Its predecessor, the Permanent Court of Int'l Justice, carried on its functions effectively for many years⁵⁸ even though the U.S. Sen-

⁵⁷ Larson, page 99.

⁵⁸ de Visscher, page 179, while recognizing that migration (and immigration) "are held today in the reserved domain of the state," yet declares this subject to be "clearly of international interest."

Therefore, one wonders, "What of the morrow?" not only in relation to immigration, but as well in relation to many other phases of domestic relations, including tariffs and the Panama Canal.

Holman (Story of the Bricker Amendment, Frank E. Holman, N.Y. 1954) points out that Article 14 of the Declaration of Human Rights declares that "everyone has the right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution" which appears to indicate a purpose to limit or regulate the rights of states to limit immigration as well as emigration.

(Immigration) "Here are some of the specific documents which the 1958-59 World Court Yearbook lists as 'providing for the Jurisdiction of the Court.' The July 28, 1951, 'Convention relative to the status of refugees'; the October 19, 1953, 'Constitution of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration'; and the 'Constitution of the International Refugee Organization.' "

Dan Smoot Report, page 243.

(Tariffs) "The whole Reciprocal Trade

ate never ratified the League of Nations Statute setting up that Court.

Sumner Welles, former Assistant Secretary of State, is quoted as saying:

"It is asserted that any subject whatever that is dealt with in a treaty between two nations becomes, by virtue of that fact, a subject of international concern."^{52a}

31. *Would such matters as civil rights and school integration in the United States be considered international law questions rather than domestic, because of the Universal Declaration and Draft Covenant on Human Rights?*

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt is quoted as declaring that the Human Rights document "does not purport to be a statement of law or legal obligations."

One hesitates to accept Mrs. Roosevelt as an authority on law, especially since she went on to say that the provisions of the Declaration and Draft Covenant should be used as an authoritative interpretation of the meaning of the UN Charter.⁵⁰

It is a theory of International Law that when a multilateral treaty, which is considered to be a "law-making treaty"⁵⁰ such as the United Nations Charter, or the Covenant on Human Rights is adopted by a majority of the nations of the World, or even by a majority of the "great powers," that its provisions then become universally binding, even upon those nations not formally accepting it.

The effect of such treaties takes still another course. All we have to do is to look to our own Supreme Court for clear and loud

Agreements Program of the Federal Government (instituted under Cordell Hull's aegis in 1934) is based on agreements between the United States government and foreign governments. . . . The American government has probably made more agreements with foreign nations on the general subject of tariffs than on any other subject." Dan Smoot Report, *ibid*.

^{52a} Report of Standing Committee on Peace and Law through the United Nations, Vol. 77, American Bar Reports, page 511 (1952).

Specialized Agencies (of UN)

"... the various specialized agencies which act in cooperation with the United Nations such as the ILO and the FAO, often operate through conventions which are framed by a particular agency and then submitted to the separate countries for ratification. . . . these conventions offered by the specialized agencies have all the scope of treaties and are of a distinctly legislative character. When a nation adheres to the constitution of a specialized agency it may become bound by the regulations issued by the agency. The specialized agencies operate under a constitution and regulations framed by their member governments." Allen, pages 38, 39.

⁵⁰ An International Bill of Rights, Holman, page 985: "In order to enforce the provisions of a bill of rights the United Nations will have to interfere continually and minutely in the internal affairs of member nations."

"Uniformity of legislation by withdrawal from state legislative control of such subjects as marriage and divorce, labor legislation, the ownership and inheritance of property, and all matters affecting aliens would be possible by exertion of the necessary treaty power." Quotation from 29 Yale Law Journal, 445, 449, as cited in *Treaties versus The Constitution*, by Roger Lea MacBride, The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1956.

⁵⁰ von Schuschnigg, page 48.

The Law of Nations, by Herbert W. Briggs, 2nd Edition, New York 1952, pages 45, 46, 871.

"On the other hand, the UN Charter (Art. 2, Sec. 6) binds nonmember States to comply with the principles of the Charter 'so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.'" Schuschnigg, page 263.

warnings on this score, when UN Charter and Human Rights provisions are relied upon by members of that august judicial body to support conclusions affecting the law and welfare of the entire United States in domestic matters.⁵¹

32. *Is there any danger that individual Americans might be tried criminally by the World Court?*

Opponents of Connally say "No." They are wrong, and they know it.

The answer is "Yes." There is great danger.

Those who have been most strident in opposition to the Connally Reservation have voiced their opinion and their purpose—their opinion that for the system of worldwide government to be effective the individual person must be reached in two ways. He must be protected, and he must be made subject to the World legal system; be controlled and restrained, prosecuted and punished, imprisoned, even executed for violation of "international crimes." The purpose, to bring this about.

It is not alone the international, United Nations bureaucracy that must be guarded against. Often more dangerous to the American's freedom are his fellow Americans, unfortunately many of them elected or appointed officials of his government, fired with a sense of responsibility to an international, one-world concept, such as we have found in the Fujii case in California, and the land restrictions cases of Missouri and Michigan.⁵² We have also seen the clear warning in the decisions of Chief Executives of this nation, in application to the Steel Strike case, and the Little Rock disorders.

Such moves were in the direction of providing shews of authority within the formless mass of the United Nations. All that is required is time and a continuation of this un-American allegiance to complete the metamorphosis of UN from a debating society to a completely formed World Government. Once such a governmental power is formulated and backed by a world police force, or by the power of a Soviet-backed satellite empire, human liberty and human freedom will be dead, and mankind will in truth live within the opaque shadow of an Orwellian existence.⁵³

33. *Does the court's record show an inclination to expand its jurisdiction beyond its legal limits?*

Larson quotes Jessup⁵⁴ for the negative answer.

⁵¹ Oyama et al. v. California, 332 United States, page 633 at 647, 648 and 673; Rice v. Sioux City Memorial Park Cemetery, Inc., 348 United States Reports, page 880; 245 Iowa Reports, page 147.

"But the realistic fact remains that every citizen of the United States, if the proposed Covenant of Human Rights is approved by the Senate, ratified, and goes into force, will have domestic law made for him by treaty submitted to only one legislative body, the Senate, and not enacted by his Congress." Allen, *ibid* page 29.

⁵² Supra.

⁵³ An International Criminal Court has been proposed by a commission within the UN. See von Schuschnigg, page 324.

For the application to individual persons, see: World Peace Through World Law, by Clark & Sohn, pages (preface) XV and XVI, 341, 342 and 343; "Blueprint for a Peaceful World," by Paul Shipman Andrews, Current History, August 1960; An International Criminal Court, by George A. Finch, vol. 38 ABAJ, page 645, August 1952.

(Note) Article 27, of the Draft International Covenant on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights provided: "The provisions of the Covenant shall extend to all parts of federal states without any limitations or exceptions." Moskowitz, page 213.

⁵⁴ Larson Pamphlet.

The past record of this Court can no more be taken as the basis for the answer than the record of the U.S. Supreme Court before Marshall's epochal decisions. Rather we must look to plans for expansion, of those most active in fighting for repeal of the Connally Amendment; as indicated in answers to the preceding questions.⁵⁵

34. *The future—Regardless of the past record of the court, can it be trusted for the future?*

The future is all that we are concerned with. There is no assurance that the Court will retain its present philosophical, culture or political composition which its champions point to as evidence of trustworthiness. There is no rule or law that will keep it static in any respect. The people of the world have no control over the Court's composition. Its members are not elected by any method of popular vote, nor are those who select the Court's members elected by any vote of major segments of the world's peoples, nor are they responsible to their theoretical constituents.⁵⁶

The composition can change within a short time. There is no vested right to membership on the Court's bench. In the USA we are familiar with the changes that take place in our own Supreme Court due to death, resignation, retirement, and the sweep of political tides.

"The future" that is meant in this question is not the immediate future, nor is the Court expected to remain the same Court. Its proponents and the anti-Connally people do not want the Court to remain the same. They foresee a Court with unlimited power, buttressed by a world police force, a world prosecuting attorney, a world detective force, a world-wide bureaucracy. All this and more. The repeal of Connally would be a big step in that direction.

Repeal would be followed by a gradual accession to power through decisions and assertion of authority, that would inexorably extend the field of arbitrary government, of world socialism, of world dictatorship, and most likely of world-wide communism.

Organs of the UN already formed would blossom in new vigor and arrogance and extend their powers into areas they dare not now invade. The judiciary and executive officers of some nations would submit to the decrees and mandates of the World Court and its hierarchy. Others would resist. Wars and revolutions would result.

For the influence of omnipotent world government would not act uniformly throughout the world. In "advanced" countries like the United States of America, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, a few European nations, and possibly India, the people would be propagandized into accepting this latter-day divine right to govern. Africa would be the dependency. (No, not a colony, for that is a horrible word in this new bright age.) The USSR would not be a part of this United Nations hegemony, for the USSR has its own world government. There would not be one world, but two worlds, until the Armageddon of mutual destruction.

No, we would not trust the Court of the future as the opponents of Connally see it. We cannot and we never will trust unlimited power anywhere in any form.

35. *Might a change in composition of the Court lead to a change from the past record of conservatism to an attitude which could prejudice the United States' interests?*

The opponents of Connally argue "No" on the grounds that through forty years the

⁵⁵ Andrews, Clark-Sohn, Moskowitz, others, *supra*.

⁵⁶ Statute of The International Court of Justice, Chapter 1, Articles 2 to 15, inclusive.

"The electoral machinery for world court judges plainly invites political maneuvering." Ober, page 65.

Court has remained steadfastly "conservative."

Here we suggest, we hope not perversely, that steadfast conservatism is the last thing the Connally repealers want. If the Court is to remain as it is and has been, there would be no demand for repeal. If the Court is to continue unaffected by the repeal of Connally, then why all the fuss?

However, you cannot judge the future by the past forty years. The first twenty-five years, of the Permanent Court of International Justice, was a period of a different Court under a different concept. The last sixteen years, the period of the ICJ, has been the era of the birth of the UNO and all the agencies and semi-independent organs under that body. The era has seen the efforts to adopt the Genocide Convention, to establish an International Criminal Court, and to bring about the recognition of the Declaration of Human Rights. These attempts threw shadows of totalitarian and welfare government over every home in America. These past sixteen years have seen attempts to lay the foundation and erect the facade of a world government. Most tragic of all, International Communism has grown to frightening power, and the words "cold war" have labeled the most bitterly fought ideological struggle in man's history, when millions of humans have been enslaved and brainwashed, and other millions threatened with like fate in furtherance of communism's surge toward world rule.

Finally, this era has seen the United States of America completely forsake its traditional aloofness and through multilateral treaties so entangle itself that now it stands as a giant bound, blind and apparently impotent from restraints largely of its own contriving.

To give the ICJ unlimited powers, and that is what is intended by the Connally repealers, would be to write the death sentence to freedom in America and kill the growth of freedom everywhere.⁶⁷

In the Senate hearings on the Law of the Sea, in the Spring of 1960, Arthur H. Dean, of the State Department, was asked by Senator Long (La.)⁶⁸

"Would you be willing to have that Court have unconditional jurisdiction if the Communist powers gain a majority on that Court?"

And Mr. Dean answered:

⁶⁷ "The United States voted to enter the Court of International Justice with reservations. . . . If this reservation had not been made, the decisions of the Court of Int'l Justice would have become the supreme law of the United States," Barnes, DAR Magazine, April 1960, page 286.

"Whatever the reasons of the Senate at the time of the passage of the Connally Reservation, the reasons now for its retention are clear and manifold." Holman Pamphlet, page 43.

"At this time of world revolution and cold war we Americans need to observe the utmost caution in taking any steps which might impede our freedom of action in unforeseen emergencies." Philip Marshall Brown, former Prof. of International Law, Princeton University, quoted in Saturday Evening Post, May 12, 1960.

⁶⁸ "Conventions On the Law of the Sea." Hearing Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Second Session, 86th Congress, January 20, 1960.

"Since nine judges constitute a quorum, and a decision is made by a majority of those present, it follows that five judges (and those might some day all be Communist judges) could make an unappealable decision as to whether an issue is or is not within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." Frank Holman (in an address made before Suffolk Law School Alumni Association, Boston, Mass., February 24, 1961, and since published in pamphlet form).

"No, I think that would be unthinkable. I personally think the whole method of selection of the judges and a whole study of the statutes of the Court, and the whole question . . . ought to be studied."

³⁶ Even though the interests of the United States are not threatened under present international law, may not international law itself change?

Connally opponents give a two-pronged answer to this:

(1) That treaties binding the USA cannot be changed or created against the will of the people of the USA.

The fallacy in this is two-fold: (a) Treaties are not enacted by the full legislative mechanism of the Congress, but by the President with the approval of only two-thirds of the Senate present at the time of voting; and (b) treaties may be construed against the interests of the USA and of any nation, and in fields over which the USA never intended that there should be external encroachment, especially in domestic fields.⁶⁹

(2) That according to "to practice and customary international law, in view of the 'dominant place' occupied by the USA in international affairs and practices, a practice or custom rejected by the US would not be considered to be a general one acquiesced in by the States" (i.e., Nation States or Nations).

Here again there is a fatal flaw in the reasoning. The United States may not long hold its "dominant place"; in fact, there are many who feel that time has already passed. The whittling away of the foundations of "American dominance" by such proposals as that of repealing Connally has already gone far towards destroying America's influence. Moreover, instead of fifty members of the United Nations, as was the case in 1945, today there are one hundred and three and tomorrow there may be a hundred and twenty-five, or more.

If a practice or custom is to be recognized by the World Court because a great power recognizes that practice or custom, we conceive that the World Court can conclude that a practice or custom recognized by the USSR, as the dominant Communist power and in view of the precarious and shifting balance of power, may prevail over that relied on by the USA. For example, the right to private property is not recognized by the Communists. So, the World Court could on this theory assert that private ownership of property is not an international custom, but that communism is, and so on.

Connally repealers say that the USA because of its "dominant position" could block a change in international law. Isn't that dishonest? Cheating? Sharp Dealing? To propose repealing of Connally, which protects us against such unfriendly charges, and at the same time say, "But see, if the other nations get tough we can use our dominant position and block them!" Where would the vaunted efficacy of world law serve in such a case? If it served at all it would be as an injunctive force prohibiting the USA from refusing to "cooperate."

There are strong suggestions for the amendment of the Charter of the United Nations and consequently accomplishing some of the changes in international law anticipated by Dr. Larson.⁷⁰ Such changes

⁶⁹ The Treaty as an Instrument of Legislation, by Florence Ellinwood Allen (Justice of U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit), New York, 1952.

"We have innumerable rights all over the World under treaties. These would all be permanently at risk." Carl Zeiss, "Cliches," id.

⁷⁰ Proposals for Changes in the United Nations, Francis O. Wilcox and Carl M. March, Brookings Institute, Washington, D.C., 1955.

This work indicates that the International Court has disappointed its champions, who

would alter the constitutional make-up of the UN and impress many socialistic, communistic and otherwise totalitarian practices upon the people of the world. We must not forget that the Charter is a treaty, and as such, in the United States, is "law of the land."

³⁷ Is a court, composed of judges from various legal systems, in addition to the Anglo-American, likely to disregard Anglo-American concepts of law and justice?

Yes. It cannot avoid doing so. In spite of the judges' presumed learning, of their assumed attitude of fairness and of passion for world law and justice, they are human, not automatons. They are subject to differing psychological, racial and national habits, and to a wide range of political tensions. Moreover, the assumption that international law is a "uniform system of law" is entirely erroneous. It is neither uniform nor certain. There is but little codification of it. Great areas exist in it where there is no developed law whatever. In such areas the Court must either refrain from acting, or as the "statute" admonishes it to do⁷¹ it must "declare" the law to be something, by ad hoc rulings if there are no established rules on the issue.⁷² The Connally repealers ignore the true character of international law.

³⁸ Do the judges feel obliged to "represent" their particular countries' interests when deciding cases?

By analysis of the voting of the judges in the past one might, if such could be done, come to a variety of conclusions. Patriotism, even chauvinism, might sway the judges. Zeal for world government, world federalism, or "union now" might do likewise. How a judge shall feel "obliged to vote," no one can say. Common sense tells us that the judge will usually be human, unless he be from a communist country. In that case he will vote as he is ordered to do.⁷³ In spite of

are desperate for some change to give it new life and power. Proposals for amending the Charter and Statute include—Extending jurisdiction of the Court in political matters; granting international organizations access to the Court; empowering the Court to settle disputes between individuals and states; establishment of an international criminal court; establishment of a court of international human rights.

⁷¹ von Schuschnigg, page 321.

⁷² "At Tokyo the objection of American defense counsel to hearsay evidence seemed hardly to be understood by the French, Dutch, and other judges whose systems allow hearsay. The Indian judge regarded the failure to comply with certain practices employed in the Courts of his country as constituting the denial of a fair trial." (And the Russians complained that Anglo-Saxon procedures unnecessarily delayed the trials.) An Introduction to International Law, by Wesley L. Gould, Harpers, N.Y. 1957, page 669.

"President John F. Kennedy, in last week's address to the nation, recognized that 'the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words; war, peace, democracy and popular will.'" Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, June 12, 1961.

See: Criminal Justice in Japan: Its Historical Background and Modern Problems, by Haruo Abe, Public Prosecutor, Japanese Ministry of Defense, Vol. 47 ABAJ, page 555, June 1961.

"Our experience in the postwar reform taught us the invaluable lesson that abstract studies of comparative law sometimes are worse than useless. . . . To make comparative law a real science, one must have some insight into the dynamic relationship between law and national tradition."

⁷³ Alfred J. Schweppe (supra page 733) discusses the "Three Types of Judges" that will be found in the World Court. He considers

the fact that only legal questions are supposed to be decided by the ICJ [i.e., until an equity tribunal is established as is urged by some],⁴⁴ political demands could be and probably would be decisive in crucial cases. We cannot establish the probabilities of the Court's conduct by Gallup Poll methods.

39. Do Communist judges vote the Communist Party line?

This question must have been coined by a naive person, or by one who has lived within an ivory tower these past forty years. Let anyone wanting to know about Communist justice, read the narrative of a Hungarian lawyer, when he tells of Communist justice in his unhappy land, who testifies to: "completely arbitrary exercises of judicial power by Communist judges without previous legislation . . . and alterations in judicial practice or in the law itself were made according to the political necessities of the day . . . in every field of law. Communist morality became a decisive factor, and militated against the old, time-honored maxims of Hungarian law based on Western legal principles and Christianity."⁴⁵

40. If the Connally amendment were repealed, would the United States be sued by Communist countries against its will?

Yes, if the Communist countries chose so to do. A Communist country could under Chapter II of the Statute make a special acceptance of jurisdiction or a general acceptance for a limited time. But be sure, no Communist country will or would go to the World Court unless it were certain that such action suited its purpose.

41. How can the Soviet Union have a judge on the Court when it has not accepted the Court's obligatory jurisdiction?

The question should be: By what moral right does a nonadhering nation have representation on the Court?

At this time there are seven judges of the Court who come from non-adhering nations. One of them (the Communist Polish representative) is presiding judge of the Court.

The answer to this is, of course, the provisions of Article 2, of Chapter 1 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

42. Does repeal of the Connally amendment imply favoring "world government"?

Repeal of the Connally Reservation would be a decisive step towards World government. In addition to the judicial system of the International Court of Justice, there would be under various conventions and the UN Charter itself, a world bank, a world economic body, a world labor organ, a world health agency, world food agency, UNESCO, a postal union, and a world legislative body in embryo. All of these organs exist today in generic form. In addition there are dozens of other, lesser, but none the less potentially potent alphabetic agencies, subsidiary and ad hoc bodies. Soon after the repeal of Connally there would follow a revision of the UN Charter, or if not a revision, the ICJ would supply advisory opinions construing the Charter, to provide a world Prosecuting Attorney, a world Regional Court, a world

the Communist Judge to be one "who is not his own master . . . to ignore these realisms seems a blind idealism."

"Communist judges are agents of the State and not independent." Ober, page 65 (citing Vishinsky and others, footnote 15).

The Lawyer in Communism, by Kalman, post.

⁴⁴ Clark and Sohn, supra.

⁴⁵ The Lawyer in Communism. Memoirs of a Lawyer, by Dr. Lajos Kalman, Boston, 1960.

The Communist is entirely cynical. "He cannot understand evenhanded justice. Khrushchev points to UN actions in the Congo . . . and claims there is no such thing as a neutral man." William R. Frye, U.N. Correspondent of Cincinnati Enquirer, July 2, 1961.

Police Force, and a correlation of all these into a cohesive body for world government.⁴⁶

43. Will decisions of the court be obeyed in the absence of an international police force?

Dr. Larson states that only Albania, in the Corfu Channel case, has neglected to comply with an adverse judgment.⁴⁷ Yet in the Monetary Gold case,⁴⁸ in five Aerial Incidents cases⁴⁹ and the Navy Neptune case⁵⁰ communist nations have refused to accede to World Court jurisdiction. As to all the other cases considered by the Court since 1945, with the possible exception of the Honduras-Nicaragua boundary dispute⁵¹ and the Minquiers and Ecrehos case which involved sovereignty over English Channel islands,⁵² none involved issues that traditionally are supposed to cause war. Even in relation to the Aerial Incidents cases, war was not the result of the failure of the Court to acquire jurisdiction. There has been no accomplishment of the Court so far that gives any color to the claim that it will be a war-avoiding instrumentality.

The United States of America would accede to World Court judgments probably to the point of national suicide if its citizens were supine enough to follow the lead of the internationalists. Obedience would be placed on an "honor" basis, as morally necessary, as a "prestige" requirement, and World Court zealots would demand obedience with religious fervor. What other nations would do would depend entirely on the political nature of those nations. Red China, Russia, the iron curtain countries, Cuba, would they accede to an adverse judgment? Not at all.

However, once the World Court were vested with the full power its champions demand for it there would follow the establishment of a World Police Force and other instrumentalities to accomplish and maintain the supremacy of international government over national government.⁵³

44. Is American opinion ready for repeal of the Connally amendment?

Americans are not being adequately informed of the truth about the movement to repeal the Connally Reservation. The opponents of the Connally Reservation are not

⁴⁶ Frank Holman brands the efforts of those who seek to rescind Connally as one of a "variety of devious maneuvers and clever resorts to semantics, to transform the United Nations into a 'world government' or to give it many of the incidents thereof." (Holman Pamphlet, page 7.)

Regional institutions "should be created all over the world," says Charles S. Rhyne (An Effective World Court Is Essential), in 46 ABAJ No. 7, page 753, July 1960.

See also: Clark and Sohn, supra; Andrews, supra; Wilcox and March, supra.

Dean Clarence Manion, in his Weekly Broadcast of the Manion Forum, February 7, 1960, stated: "If the Connally Reservation is shunted, the United States has passed another milestone to one-worldism and loss of sovereignty."

⁴⁷ United Kingdom v. Albania, ICJ Rep. 15.
⁴⁸ Italy v. France, United Kingdom and U.S.A., id. 19.

⁴⁹ Israel v. Bulgaria, id. 127; United States v. Hungarian People's Republic, id. 99; United States v. USSR, id. 103; United States v. Czechoslovakia, id. 6; United States v. USSR, id. 9.

⁵⁰ United States v. USSR, id. 158.

⁵¹ Honduras v. Nicaragua, id. 192.

⁵² France v. United Kingdom, id. 47.

⁵³ Blueprint for A Peaceful World, by Paul Shipman Andrews, Current History, August 1960; In Place of Folly, Norman Cousins, Harpers, 1961 (the author suggests a police force of one million); World Peace Through World Law, Clark and Sohn (who propose a police force of 10,000).

telling the whole truth. They are asking the American people to trust their liberties to people and organizations over whom the American people can have no control or restraint. Americans who are fully informed on the issues involved are staunchly against repeal.

The American Legion, whose living members have fought in three wars for American liberties, the Daughters of the American Revolution, whose ancestors wrote the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights after having won their freedom by daring sacrifice and revolution, and many other patriotic bodies, have consistently stood for retention of the Reservation. Influential leaders of conservative Americans, including many of the most eminent, highly honored lawyers and jurists, are fighting for its retention. Editorial policy of the leading newspapers and journals of the country have followed this purpose. Students of International Law have likewise advised retention until some time in the future when International Law may have developed sufficiently to warrant such an experiment.

We challenge the statement that "American opinion is ripe for repeal."⁵⁴

45. Is American opinion ready to accept the prospects of losing as well as winning cases before the Court?

This question indicates an assumption that "winning cases" and "losing cases" are ultimate consequences of adherence to the World Court; whereas in truth the outcome of any one of a dozen cases is of small importance compared to the pervasive influence of judicial decrees and declarations of world law based upon such law-making treaties and conventions as the UN Charter, the Declaration and Covenant on Human Rights, the Labor Convention, the Law of the Sea, and so on, which will be impressed on nations as domestic law whether they like it or not; and the coining of new theories and dicta, through ad hoc pronouncements. Thus, and not by the deciding of particular cases would

⁵⁴ "We seem always to have in this country a considerable number of ordinarily patriotic citizens who have convinced themselves that the only way to attain world peace is to give America away . . . not only in the form of money and material resources, but also in the form of giving up and surrendering our sovereignty and our precious American rights and liberties as fixed and guaranteed by our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, and hitherto regarded as inalienable." Holman Pamphlet, page 17.

See series of seven articles by political analyst and columnist Forrest Davis, in the Cincinnati Enquirer, August 1960.

Leading Editorial Opinion of the land supports preservation of Connally (a partial list follows):

The New Age—April 1960.
Review and Outlook—August 31, 1960.
Chicago Daily Tribune—August 6, 1960.
Saturday Evening Post—March 12, 1960.
Indianapolis Star—March 8, 1960.
Richmond News Leader—September 2, 1960.

The Baltimore Sun—January 24, 1961.
The Tablet (Brooklyn)—January 14, 1961.

Seattle Post Intelligencer—September 2, 1960.

Wall Street Journal—October 14, 1959.
Tulsa Daily World—September 2, 1960.
Chicago Daily Tribune—September 26, 1960.

The Cincinnati Enquirer—August 12, 1960.
Inquirer, Philadelphia—September 2, 1960.
Evening World Herald (Omaha).

Times-Picayune-New Orleans—February 18, 1960.

Review and Outlook—February 29, 1960.
New York Daily News—January 9, 1961.
Catholic Standard and Times—October 7, 1960.

the ICJ move to become the actual ruler of the world.

But to return to the matter of winning and losing cases. Americans have been losing so much ground in international dealings recently that they have become accustomed to inept fruitless foreign adventures of their servants in the government; have in fact come to feel almost fatalistic about such matters.

When Americans do realize the truth about the implications of unlimited adherence to the World Court, and the inexorable shift into a world government, they will respond in no uncertain terms. The response will be a surprise to those who think they can impose an autocratic or bureaucratic world government upon 185,000,000 American citizens.

"The first step toward World Law is for the nations of the world to develop the habit of submitting international disputes to the World Court for settlement and not to beguile themselves into the idea of giving up the right to determine when a dispute is domestic and when international."—FRANK E. HOLMAN.

STEBEN AND THE GERMAN CONTRIBUTION TO THE WINNING OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, September 17 marks the 237th anniversary of the birth of Friedrich Wilhelm Ludolf Gerhard Augustin von Steuben, or to use the name that he assumed in later life, Friedrich Wilhelm August Heinrich Ferdinand von Steuben. On this occasion it is fitting to reflect upon the German contribution to the cause of American independence.

Steuben was born at Magdeburg where his father was stationed as a lieutenant of engineers in the army of Frederick William I of Prussia. He was educated in the Jesuit schools in Breslau and in his seventeenth year he entered the officer corps of the Prussian Army. He served with credit throughout the Seven Years' War. It was his experience as a general staff officer from May 1762 to the end of the war that especially equipped Steuben for his service to the cause of American independence.

After a period of service as chamberlain at the Court of Hohenzollern-Hechingen, he sought service with the American forces. Armed with a letter of introduction from Benjamin Franklin, he landed at Portsmouth, N.H., on December 1, 1777, and journeyed overland to York, Pa., the temporary seat of Government. His services were accepted by the Continental Congress and he was directed to report to Washington at Valley Forge, where he arrived on February 23, 1778.

His efforts toward the training and discipline of the American troops were so successful that Congress on May 5 confirmed his appointment as inspector general with the rank of major general. He developed a system of property ac-

counting that went far to check the waste of public property that had formerly prevailed. After the disastrous retreat of Charles Lee at Monmouth, Steuben reformed the disordered troops and led them back into battle. In these and many other respects, Steuben's services proved of incalculable value to the patriot cause.

After his honorable discharge from the Army on March 24, 1784, he made his residence in New York and became a popular figure in the social life of the city and State. He served as president of the German Society and of the New York branch of the Society of the Cincinnati. In 1787 he was elected one of the regents of the University of the State of New York. In 1786 the State of New York granted him 16,000 acres of land north of Utica. Always careless in his business affairs and extravagant in his charities and hospitality, he found himself in financial difficulty and was saved from bankruptcy only by a friendly mortgage on his New York lands arranged by Alexander Hamilton and other influential friends. In June 1790 the new Federal Government granted him a pension of \$2,500 a year. He died on November 28, 1794, on his estate in the Mohawk country and there he is buried.

Steuben was not the only German who came from foreign shores to aid the American cause. John Kalb, or Baron de Kalb as he is sometimes called, Gerhard von der Wieden, Heinrich Emanuel Luterloh, Johann Paul Schott, and Baron Friedrich Heinrich von Wissenfels were among the others who contributed their services.

It does not detract from the credit due these distinguished officers to say that possibly even more significant were the efforts of hundreds of colonists of German birth or extraction. Inspired by Peter Muhlenberg, Nicholas Herkimer, Christopher Ludwig, and other leaders, they rallied to the patriot cause. A regiment called the German Fusiliers was organized in 1775 in Charleston, S.C. In 1776 a German regiment consisting of four companies from Maryland and four from Pennsylvania was raised, and in the following year a ninth company was added. The Salzburger of Georgia served nobly in the struggle for freedom, as did German militia and sharpshooters from the Mohawk Valley and the Valley of Virginia. Germans participated in battles at Princeton, Brandywine, Savannah, Monmouth, Oriskany, and Yorktown, to mention only a few. They contributed in no small measure to the successful outcome of the war for American independence.

CITIZENSHIP DAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in the oppressive heat of a muggy Philadelphia summer in 1787, a group of 55 men of

every shade of opinion, occupation, and age sat down to contemplate the creation of a more perfect Union, a state of political felicity such as civilized man has never known. For 4 months they thrashed out the great issues of political theory and practical politics. When they stood up, the fruit of their labor was found to be a simple but sophisticated mosaic of second choices, a bundle of compromises which breathed life into our infant Nation and secured the blessings of liberty both to them and their posterity.

The blessings of liberty were indeed secured for us, who live in an ultra-modern and extraordinarily complex 20th-century America extending from sea to sea and yet beyond, by a group of men living in a predominately rural and confined area of the eastern seaboard. This fact, in itself, stands as just tribute to their wisdom and genius. Yet further tribute is fitting for their remarkable success and for their ability to create a document so simple in language yet so sophisticated in ideas as to endure two centuries of profound change in our American society.

Because the Constitution was signed in the 17th day of September 1787, and because it made possible for us a kind of life for which we should be thankful, we have chosen that day to honor it and to rededicate ourselves to its principles by celebrating Citizenship Day. On this day, we should contemplate the wisdom of that document by which we have grown to be the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. Its impact on our growth and on the world at large cannot be underestimated. Conceived in the wealth of our English heritage, born in the aftermath of victory, and written in the blood of those brave souls who died to realize such victory, it set forth unique, lofty, and lasting principles of liberty and justice for all and of a sovereign union of sovereign States. Bold in conception and yet a basis to happiness, these principles were able to bridge the gap between theory and practice and to provide us with a citizenship of freedom unparalleled in the world. It is the torch which lights the free world by its example and flickers in the darkness of the world in chains, offering hope to the oppressed.

Liberty and justice are the keystones of our citizenship, and responsibility is their guardian. We must not falter in that responsibility to uphold democracy, to participate in our Government by voting, to support our laws, and today, especially, to cherish our citizenship. For our strength is in our good citizenship and in our dedication to carrying forward our great heritage.

LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY I. W. ABEL

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I. W.

Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, and a vice president of the AFL-CIO, declared in his Labor Day address that the people of America's ghettos today are suffering an unemployment rate far worse than that experienced in the worst of the great depression.

Mr. Abel, who is a member of the President's Special Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, not only described the situation in our slum areas today, but proposed means of correction. The talk was heard on the Columbia Broadcasting System radio network.

So that we may all be able to be familiar with what Mr. Abel said, I insert the text of his message in the RECORD at this point:

This is labor's day, traditionally, a brief period of rest, recreation and acknowledgment of the role that labor plays in the progress of our great country. But on this Labor Day there perhaps is one subject that is uppermost in our thoughts—and that is the literal imprisonment of millions of Americans in the nation's ghettos.

The violence, destruction and death that has been suffered in more than 30 American cities this year compels us to conduct a national search for the right answers to the problems that exist in our cities.

President Johnson defined this serious domestic problem very well in his message on the cities in 1966. At that time, he said: "We cannot become two people, the suburban affluent and the urban poor, each filled with mistrust and fear, one for the other."

Two years ago, the President put the issue in this context: "The problems of the cities are problems of housing and education. They involve increasing employment and ending poverty. They are, in large measure," the President added, "the problems of American society itself."

So far there has been a virtual cascade of recommendations to solve the problem. There have been suggestions for immediate action and long-range action. Some talk about a Marshall Plan for the cities. Others call for the Government to act as the employer of last resort—that is, if a worker is willing and able to work and cannot find a job, the Government will hire him for some type of public works project.

Interestingly enough, the latter proposal should forcefully remind us that full employment is a goal to which our nation has been committed since passage of the Employment Act of 1946. Just a few weeks ago, a bill that would help us reach that goal was introduced in the United States House of Representatives. It would provide a million new jobs a year for persons now unemployed or seriously underemployed.

The sponsor of this bill, Democratic Representative James O'Hara of Michigan, said the bill calls for a massive investment in the grants to federal, state and local government agencies . . . and to private non-profit groups . . . to bear the cost of providing the jobs. Representative O'Hara concedes that such a law will not solve all our problems, but we of labor agree that it is a forthright beginning to get at the root-cause of our problems.

There can be no quarrel with the general objectives of this and many other suggestions that are being made. Nor can there be any quarrel that something must be done, and done in a hurry, to bring positive hope to the ghettos and to restore domestic tranquility.

Today I would like to talk about one approach to solving the over-all ghetto problem . . . a long-range approach as contrasted to the many, short-term, immediate steps that have been suggested in recent weeks.

I believe that, regardless of what is done in the months and the year ahead of us, two keys to the long-range solution of the ghetto problem are education and job training. An examination of the employment crisis in the cities' slum areas . . . and it is a crisis of serious proportions . . . underscores the necessity of education and job training for any lasting answer to the immediate problem.

The United States Department of Labor and the New York State Labor Department recently worked together in a project to assess the total problem of unemployment in the slum ghettos. The usual employment indexes count only those able and willing to work. The U.S. Labor Department and the New York department took what they called "a sub-employment index" as a more accurate means of measuring the actual number of jobless people. They counted the regular unemployed, the jobless who have dropped out of the labor market in despair, those who have low-paying part-time jobs but still trying to get full-time jobs, and those known to be living in the slum ghettos but who do not show up in either employment or unemployment surveys. The results of the sub-employment study were quite shocking.

They showed, for example, a sub-employment rate of 33% for East Harlem, 28% for Central Harlem, 45% for New Orleans, 34% for Philadelphia, 38% for St. Louis, 47% for San Antonio and 24% for San Francisco.

Our economy is producing more jobs but the lack of education and training make it impossible to match the joblessness of the slums with the new jobs that are being created. In just one of our major cities for example, there is an area with 10,000 jobless people who have an eighth-grade education or less.

The people of America's ghettos today are suffering an unemployment rate that is far worse than what everybody else experienced during the worst of the Great Depression. In other words, the Depression has never ended for many Negroes and members of other minority groups, in our cities.

There is no doubt that people of the slum areas must be given better educations to allow them to compete for jobs more successfully. And Negro children need special training and education because they tend to come mainly from homes where learning and books are both unknown. Actually, more than 400,000 eighteen-year-old Negroes enter the job market every year and hardly ten percent of them have the true equivalent of a normal white middle-class education.

So without any question, the quality of education in the ghettos must be improved and any special training that is required to compensate for any learning handicaps must also be provided. This is not to say that no special effort has been made in the past, because eight million disadvantaged children are today benefiting from the landmark education bills passed by Congress in 1965. But it is to say that much more needs to be done. And President Johnson has shown his compassion for this need by recommending funds totaling \$1.6 billion under the Elementary-Secondary Education Act for fiscal 1968.

Organized labor supported the Elementary and Secondary Education Act when it was passed in 1965 by the 89th Congress. We did so not only because labor traditionally supports efforts to improve our educational system, but also because the act placed a special emphasis on aiding children from low-income families.

The 89th Congress extended and expanded the Manpower Development and Training Act to help jobless workers displaced by automation and to help other workers upgrade their skills to prepare them for better jobs. Again, in his legislative recommendation for the next fiscal year, President Johnson has recognized the important role of

such a program by calling for an appropriation of \$439 million.

This emphasis upon job training and retraining is one of the keys to a long-range solution of ghetto problems that I mentioned earlier.

I am happy to say, along this line, that organized labor is not only doing what it can to win congressional approval of such manpower programs but we are helping in other ways. We are developing job training programs of our own, in cooperation with industry and the Government.

Specifically, the United Steelworkers of America this month—in fact tomorrow—will begin a voluntary pilot training program for some 1600 unskilled and untrained workers. The program is designed to upgrade the workers' educational levels to enable them to qualify for job opportunities when available. Arrangements for the program were made by the Steelworkers Union, the major basic steel companies and the Federal Government. The program will be funded by the Federal Government under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The format of the plan was developed as a result of a joint study provided for in the current agreement between the union and the 10 major basic steel companies. Seven of the companies have plants in the Chicago and Baltimore areas, the two locations selected for the pilot program.

At the end of the training program, the workers will have gone through 150 hours of upper level grade school and high school courses at a rate of six hours a week. They will do their studying before or just after the working shifts.

The program drew words of praise from Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. He called the program "a most significant effort that could prove of great value not only in upgrading the educational levels of steelworkers but also workers in other areas."

"This is the kind of concerted action" . . . the Secretary said . . . "that is so vital in our national efforts to help every American better enjoy the dignity and economic security that flow from the full use of his talents."

Secretary Wirtz put it very well. Added dignity and more economic security are the two ingredients which are basic to the real enjoyment of life but which are still out of reach for the untrained and under-educated.

But this pilot training program, involving the steelworkers, the major basic steel companies and the Government, will help make such ingredients a reality for many workers who otherwise would find their present jobs blind alleys.

This is the kind of forward step that doesn't attract too much attention when it is first announced. But that doesn't detract from its importance as an event of real significance in our over-all efforts to help people help themselves.

Labor is also working with Government and other groups along these same lines for providing jobs and training. Labor's close identity with the Job Corps has led to the development of a Job Corps Visitation and Recruiting Program. It also has brought labor leaders together with officials of the Job Corps Center to help in the placement of youths and in recruiting for the Job Corps. More than 25 international unions and 23 state central bodies have participated in the program.

Labor is also working with the National Urban League in a program called LEAP—the Labor Education Advancement Program. As an example of what this means, LEAP has started a program sponsored by the Baltimore Urban League and the Baltimore Building Trades Council, financed under a contract with the Federal Manpower Administrator. Through this program, minority youth groups will be recruited and prepared to qualify for placement in building trades

apprenticeship programs which will teach them a craft, such as carpentry and plumbing.

These kinds of programs, as I said, do not produce front-page headlines. But they are the bits and pieces which, taken together, will help us solve the total problem. They are the kind of long-range programs that must be repeated many times in as many locations as possible. Just as the short-range, immediate programs have their place, these other kinds of educational and job training programs also have a place in providing a genuine and lasting answer to the problems of the ghettos.

The immediate task before us this Labor Day 1967 is to do what must be done if and as many jobs as are needed to give the jobless some real hope for a brighter tomorrow. The long-range task is to continue and expand what already has begun—in the way of education and job training—so that such hopes can endure beyond tomorrow.

RONALD REAGAN RIDES AGAIN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, out of a scene reminiscent of a thundering wild west movie—with papier mache six guns blazing, and sound stage cameras rolling—Gov. Ronald Reagan has shown the world that Barry Goldwater is not the only Republican with an itchy finger on the atomic button.

Yesterday in Sacramento, Governor Reagan made it crystal clear that when he urges the use of America's "full technology" to wage war in Vietnam, he means the unrestricted use of atomic weapons.

Is this the man America wants to entrust with the destiny of its country?

Is this the irresponsible man Republican leaders are talking up as a possible presidential nominee?

A respected California newspaper, the Sacramento Bee, recently wrote of Governor Reagan:

It would be national suicide to reward a man with the custodianship of any larger area of government than the one he has now.

This is sound advice.

For Governor Reagan is not only easy with the atomic trigger, he would also give responsibility for sharp escalation of the Vietnam war to military commanders.

But what about the consequences? What about possible Chinese involvement? What about our Constitution which says the President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces?

I am not sure how Governor Reagan's remarks are going over in the rest of America.

But I will tell you that they scare me, as they should scare any responsible American citizen.

Vietnam is not a sound stage. The decisions there are not made by script girls or directors. And the fate of the Nation is not decided at the box office.

I suggest that we take this Reagan

film, cut it, and can it, for release in the year 2000—for purely historical purposes.

EAST-WEST BARRIERS MUST BE TORN DOWN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Chicago Daily News of August 22 makes the point that in this world, progress toward peace can only come about through lowering barriers between East and West, not through raising barriers. This is particularly true in the case of trade, which the writer aptly describes as a potential instrument for peace. I insert this thoughtful editorial in the RECORD at this point:

COMMERCE WORKS FOR PEACE

The American Legion's national commander, John E. Davis, finds any expansion of East-West trade unthinkable while "hostilities backed by the entire Communist world continue in Vietnam." That is a rousing stand but hardly a realistic one. The Communist world (or rather, worlds by now) is divided over a number of issues, including the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

Whether it stays split, or divides even further, may well depend upon just such instruments as U.S. trade with the non-Chinese Communist countries. Yugoslavia and Romania are examples of bloc countries whose ties with the Soviets have been loosened by trade with the West.

But more important than the sheer politics of the matter is the fact that trade is a potential instrument for peace, opening avenues of communication and advancing the mutual welfare.

Davis argues that "anything that we do to provide consumer satisfaction in the Soviet Union frees Soviet energies and resources for their aggressive external policies." More likely, more consumer goods in a Communist country would only whet the popular appetite for more and more of the same. That is a tendency of human nature that can supersede Marxian dogma. And energies spent by the Communist countries in satisfying consumer appetites cannot be devoted to building tanks and planes.

So we disagree with the Legion's Davis, and with Sen. Dirksen, who would bar Communist countries from buying U.S. consumer goods through the Export-Import Bank. In the real world we live in, progress can come only through tearing down barriers, not raising them.

LET US ALL JOIN FORCES FOR A NEW URBAN AMERICA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the an-

nouncement today at the White House that the insurance industry of America is ready and willing to invest \$1 billion in housing and jobs for the central city areas, is a dramatic illustration of the country's ability and willingness to write a Magna Carta for urban America.

It is a stunning salute to the tireless efforts of President Johnson and his allies in the Congress.

It is a public call to renewed effort to rebuild our cities, and give their inhabitants the housing, job and other opportunities to which they are entitled as first-class citizens.

But today's announcement is more—it is a challenge to the House of Representatives.

It is a challenge to redress the ill-conceived action which rejected the full funding for rent supplements.

It is a challenge to restore the full appropriations for model cities.

It is a challenge to stop political debate and vote the President's full request for this year's antipoverty program.

It is a challenge to every elected official to get on with the work of making our cities the finest, the best, the healthiest, the most emulated in the world.

President Johnson's blueprint for urban America stands revealed before us.

Private enterprise has now said yes to it with hard cold cash.

Can the Congress do any less?

I do not think so.

The people are waiting for us to act.

REPUBLICANS BACK CRIME IN ITS FIGHT AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party in recent weeks, particularly the distinguished minority leader and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] have gone to great lengths to criticize President Johnson's war on crime. They have charged that the President is not doing enough or moving fast enough to fight crime. Of course these charges are entirely politically motivated and have nothing to do with the facts. While I do not question the right of any member of the minority party to engage in political distortions, at the same time I must strongly object when such partisan politics are used to hurt the small businessmen of our Nation.

Yesterday, this body passed H.R. 10409, a bill that provides new authorizations for the Small Business Administration and also revamps the small business investment company program. A third portion of that bill would have appropriated \$300,000 for a study to be conducted by the Small Business Administration to determine the best ways that small businessmen can protect themselves from burglaries, robberies, shoplifting, vandalism, and other criminal acts. This clearly was legislation designed to fight

the crime problem as it now exists. The study was not designed to find out if small businessmen were being victimized by criminals but rather to find answers and solutions to the problem. The study was not designed to look into the sociological reasons behind the recent riots but rather was designed to help small businessmen protect their businesses if riots should develop. The study has been endorsed by the Small Business Administration and the White House and by small businessmen and their business groups across the Nation. It was hoped that as an outgrowth of this study, a Government-industry insurance program would be devised so that small businessmen could obtain adequate insurance protection.

Despite the pressing need for such a study, the Republican Members of this body, with only a few exceptions, voted to strip the funds from this study, a move that might possibly mean that the study cannot be undertaken. Even if the study can be conducted, it will mean that the Small Business Administration will not be able to hire outside consultants and to bring experts to Washington to lend their much needed assistance.

It is interesting to note that the two Members of this body who have criticized the Johnson administration for not doing enough to fight crime, were the leaders of the gutting move, the distinguished minority leader and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. It was the gentleman from Missouri who offered the amendments to strip the funds from the study and it was the distinguished minority leader who urged Members not to vote for the funds.

Based on the actions of the Republican Party with regard to this study, it can only be assumed that Republicans are willing to sacrifice the small businesses of our Nation to score a few political points. It is unfortunate that the millions of small businessmen of our Nation were chosen as the victims of the Republican political plot.

Once again the Republican Party has used one of its four legislative horsemen, "Cut," "Gut," "Weaken," and "Stall," to victimize the American people.

While the Republicans charge President Johnson with not doing enough to fight the war on crime, the Republicans have stepped up their attack to help crime fight small business.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN L. TAYLOR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable success of the committee system in our legislative branch of Government is due in large measure to the faithful service, year after year, of experts in many fields on our committee staffs.

The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has been highly favored

with the diligence and the wealth of knowledge of a man whose profession was "geographer," an expert on the world and its peoples. The recent death of this man, Dr. John L. Taylor, has left a vacancy which can never again be filled in quite the same manner, for there is only one such man.

During my first term in Congress, I was asked by our committee chairman to undertake a trip to the Pacific Trust Territory. Because those of us who made the trip were well briefed by Dr. Taylor before we left, we went to Micronesia as a committee with a stated purpose: to investigate the social, economic, and educational conditions of these island peoples, and to report and recommend.

Throughout our trip, Dr. Taylor was at our service with the information he knew we would need. As a relatively new Congressman, I was given a feeling of the great importance of our mission. We saw, we worked, we recommended.

Partly as a result of this visit, I introduced legislation to establish a memorial on Guam to all who gave their lives to liberate these Pacific Islands in World War II. Here again, Dr. Taylor was of great assistance in providing necessary information for this bill.

The depth of this fine man's feeling for the welfare of the islands placed under the legislative care of his committee is reflected in the fact that his family requested that those wishing to honor him at his funeral might make contributions to the John L. Taylor Scholarship Fund, to help provide the educations needed to prepare these people in the far Pacific for free and effective self-government.

His great knowledge and dedicated efforts will continue to bear fruit for many years to come.

STRONG SUPPORT FOR OEO

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I see the Office of Economic Opportunity as a tower of hope on the landscape of poverty. The programs of the OEO have reached into the poorest rural communities and city slums in America. They have touched preschool children with Headstart, and unemployed teenagers with the Job Corps; they have touched talented youngsters in poverty with Upward Bound, and our neglected aged citizens with Foster Grandparents; touched our sick with health services, and our exploited poor with legal services.

The riots which leveled parts of our cities left that tower of hope standing. I think Mr. Shriver himself put it very well when he appeared before the House Education and Labor Committee. He pointed out:

In the 27 cities where riots have occurred, the total damage to buildings in the ghettos

is \$273,652,800. OEO pays rent on 491 facilities in these 27 cities. Not a single one was burned. Not a single one was looted. Why? Because like buildings displaying the Red Cross in time of war, the people recognized that these facilities were among the few places where they could find refuge and aid.

Mr. Speaker, I think the present criticism of the OEO represents a terrible irony. Now that OEO has survived the riots and stands alone like a beacon astride a now even more needy population, it is enduring the lightning bolts of misdirected wrath by those who seek a scapegoat for our urban woes. I think Mr. Shriver's reference to the Red Cross was appropriate. No one in his right mind thinks that by bombing a Red Cross hospital he is hastening an end to the war. In the war on poverty the OEO, like the Red Cross hospital, is on the field of battle to treat the casualties, not to stir up trouble.

In the cities served by the poverty program in which there have been riots, there are more than 12,000 people employed in the poverty program. In these same cities the police arrested some 6,700 persons. Of these 6,700 persons arrested only seven were paid poverty workers. Only seven individuals out of 12,000 employed. And of those arrested none were charged with anything in excess of a misdemeanor. Are we to fire 12,000 people and thereby punish the tens of thousands they serve because seven people were arrested? I certainly hope not. And let me add that none of these seven have yet been convicted of any crime.

I certainly hope we have not come to the point of utter foolishness where we abolish a program and write off the population it serves just because of the arrest of seven individuals. We are not so silly as to burn the barn to roast the pig.

The unwarranted recent criticism of the war on poverty has, in fact, obscured some terribly important examples of how antipoverty workers have actually helped prevent the outbreak of violence, even when there was imminent danger of physical harm to themselves.

Mayor Tollefson of Tacoma, Wash., has said:

In city after city persons associated with the poverty program have actually made important contributions to preventing or minimizing disturbance which has threatened.

Mayor Doorley, of Providence, R.I., told an antipoverty group:

As far as I'm concerned, there is no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you.

The Minneapolis police have said that poverty workers were "a key factor" in limiting the violence in the streets of that city.

Captain Bruno, of the Youngstown, Ohio, police department, praised poverty program police cadets as people "who calm down a hothead spoiling for a fight or mingle in a crowd urging excited youngsters to go home."

Police Commissioner Spina, of Newark, has described as "magnificent" young Neighborhood Youth Corps police cadets who worked 12-hour shifts during the worst part of the Newark riot assisting police.

Captain Francis Pierce, of the Grand

Rapids, Mich., riot squad, has had high praise for 50 antipoverty workers who worked in that city's riot area helping the police. He said:

They are doing a beautiful job and, believe me, we appreciate it.

And I might add that two of these youngsters were wounded by shotgun blasts in the performance of their duties.

This same story of poverty workers working to assist law-enforcement officials keep the peace has been repeated in Toledo, Ohio; Chicago, Ill.; Elizabeth, N.J.; East and West, North and South.

And this positive work has not been confined to riot prevention. Two hundred VISTA volunteers have gone to work rebuilding in the ruins of Detroit. They went, without expectation of reward or remuneration, at the call of Governor Romney and Mayor Cavanaugh. And more than 4,000 other VISTA volunteers are quietly going about their selfless work around the country as I speak to you.

Mr. Speaker, it is an old saying that a man is known by the company he keeps. I think that is a fair statement. I think it is also true that you can tell a lot about a man by who his enemies are.

Well, Sargent Shriver and his Office of Economic Opportunity have some very fine friends, some very distinguished friends. Rev. Billy Graham is one of the friends of the poverty program. So are some of the most prominent leaders of all our other religious faiths.

The poverty program has friends in business, too. Men like Walker L. Cislser, chairman of the board of the Detroit Edison; men like Roger Sonnabend, president of the Hotel Corp. of America; men like Dr. Charles Jones, president of the Humble Oil & Refining Co.; men like Carl Gerstacker, chairman of the board of the Dow Chemical Co. These are a few of the more than 50 most respected leaders of American business and industry who compose the Business Leadership Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The OEO enjoys the strong support of the American Bar Association for its legal services program. It has the support of prominent educators, doctors, and social scientists for its Headstart program. It cooperates with 18 major corporations who operate OEO Job Corps centers. It works with more than 200 colleges and universities who have OEO Upward Bound projects.

And OEO has the support of people who know the problems of our cities and are charged with the responsibility of solving them. No Governor I know of has urged that OEO be abolished, nor any mayor of any major city.

The OEO, under Sargent Shriver's brilliant leadership, has gained the kinds of friends, and enjoys the kinds of support among respectable organizations and institutions, that reflects the growing evidence of its great success.

The OEO has earned the kind of enemies, in my opinion, that are equally a measure of its success. The OEO is opposed by Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown. The OEO was condemned by the recent conference on "black power" in Newark. The OEO has been assailed by

extremists of the left and extremists of the right. It is under consistent and mounting attack from the black racists who know that when OEO succeeds in a community the ground is no longer fertile for demagoguery.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the opponents of OEO in this Congress to become aware of the company they keep. I am, of course, not suggesting that all opponents of OEO are individuals of the Rap Brown or John Birch variety. But I invite those who find themselves in a jeering section with such people to rethink their position.

The OEO is a marvelous young program. It enjoys the support of serious men. And it deserves such support.

WILL THE WALL DIVIDE VIETNAM?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, ever since Mr. Robert S. McNamara, our Secretary of Defense, proposed the building of a wall which would be a barrier in the demilitarized zone of Vietnam, much has been written and said about its possible effectiveness.

I cannot see how this highly complex installation will prevent the infiltration of the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong into South Vietnam. As expensive and as highly technical a device as it can be, I do not feel that it will keep away the invader if he desires to infiltrate into South Vietnam.

Stronger fortifications have been built in the past, and each was the ultimate in design of the times. But, each had its failings and each fell to the attackers in time.

In connection with the proposal of Secretary McNamara, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared on September 11, 1967 in the RECORD, a highly respected paper with wide circulation in Bergen County, N.J., part of which is the congressional district I have the honor to represent in Congress.

There is much food for thought in this editorial and I commend it to my colleagues for a review of its contents.

Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial as part of my remarks on McNamara's proposal:

MR. McNAMARA'S CHINESE WALL

It is likely to be exceedingly difficult to discuss Secretary McNamara's plans, announced in a dazzling display of secrecy, to build a barrier strip parallel to the demilitarized zone dividing the two Vietnams—at any rate, to discuss the plans with a straight face.

Nobody with any decent veneration of science will let himself hoot at a wall consisting of things like chlorophenyl dimethyl urea and geophone seismic detectors. Such sophisticated weaponry may not annihilate the foe, but if he stops to pronounce the names he'll be rendered helpless by dislocation of the jaw.

So nobody is likely to protest the establishment of the chemically and electronically sterilized cordon—it's technique, and if it facilitates United States troops' locating infiltrators and running them off the premises, fine! What does arouse the conditioned reflex called suspicion is the public relations buildup, the atmosphere of gimmickry, the sad shrill cry that here is what you have been waiting for—*instant miracles!*

Mr. McNamara, opponent of escalation and proponent of the theory that the enemy in Vietnam cannot be bombed to the negotiation table, might be suspected, if he were a less humorless man, of engaging in an elaborate spoof. We can't stop the Communists with jet bombers and blockbusters, tanks and napalm and Navy rifles; so we'll stop them by building a Chinese Wall. How's that for a switcheroo? All that's wrong with it is this: the Great Wall of China never did stop any invaders who meant business. Well, then, let's call it our own impregnable Maginot Line.

And let's try to forget that, as Hitler flanked the Maginot Line and left it impregnable till it surrendered, Ho can flank the chlorophenyl dimethyl urea line by veering west through Laos, Cambodia, and so on. That wouldn't escalate the war. It would merely extend it across southeast Asia—and our commitment with it. Don't chuckle.

INVOLVEMENT OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN REBUILDING AMERICAN CITIES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, another key step was announced today in the President's plans to insure maximum involvement of the private sector in rebuilding our cities. The life insurance companies have agreed to commit \$1 billion for investment in the city core areas to improve housing conditions. Each life insurance company will subscribe their share of this amount on a pro rata basis according to assets.

In announcing this commitment, Mr. Fitzhugh, president of Metropolitan Life Insurance, said that the life insurance associations had sought for some time to define a larger role for companies in the progress of our core cities. Last May 19 a special committee on urban problems was created, which was composed of chief executive officers of representative companies. They questioned how their investment capabilities could be more usefully brought to bear while at the same time safeguarding the interest of policyholders. The announcement today was but the first of the recommendations of this committee. They are continuing their work on this problem.

Certainly, I offer my congratulations to Mr. Fitzhugh and the life insurance companies for their commitment of resources to rebuild our core city areas. This is an adventurous step for private enterprise and one which I hope will serve as an example to companies across the Nation.

Also, I believe that we should take notice of the direction in which this

administration is moving to assure that private enterprise does have the option to participate in the rehabilitation of our cities. In mid-August President Johnson and Secretary Weaver announced the launching of Turnkey II effort which will provide a profit element in management as well as construction of low-income housing. Already developers are preparing private construction and management projects in three cities. For example, in New York City, a 929-unit facility will be built by a private contractor and operated by a private management firm.

Also, there was a recent agreement between HUD and SBA to aid the development of small businesses by encouraging the provision of commercial space in FHA 221(d) (3) projects. Still another effort that offers promise for involving private enterprise is the rent supplement program.

These efforts combined with today's announcement of a \$1 billion commitment by life insurance companies provide a highly sophisticated degree of cooperation between Government and business. It is with this type of interchange and cooperation, I believe, that we can begin the massive task of rebuilding our cities.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM OFFERS OPPORTUNITY FOR \$1 BILLION INVESTMENT BY INSURANCE INDUSTRY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. Eugene Fitzhugh, president of Metropolitan Life Insurance, reported to President Johnson and Secretary Robert C. Weaver that the life insurance industry has pledged a special effort to work toward alleviation of the problems of the central cities. In making this announcement Mr. Fitzhugh said:

We recognize the size of the task this nation faces if it is to improve the social and physical fabric of our central cities and the quality of the life of the people there. To help accomplish this task we shall divert from the normal stream of our investments \$1 billion for investment in the city core areas to improve housing conditions and to finance job creating enterprises.

This capital will be made available for projects which would not ordinarily have been financed under normal business practices because of the high risks involved. Specifically, Mr. Fitzhugh pointed out that the rent supplement program offers many opportunities for constructive action.

Accordingly, I believe that this type of corporate commitment provides ample evidence as to why Congress should support the rent supplement program. Many supporters of the rent supplement program have contended that it is a unique vehicle for encouraging private

enterprise to participate in programs designed to meet the housing needs of low-income families. Today's announcement substantiated those arguments.

I would urge my colleagues to join with me in commending Mr. Fitzhugh and the life insurance companies, President Johnson, and Secretary Robert C. Weaver for making possible this unique example of private enterprise's willingness to work toward improving the quality of life in American cities.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED "NEW COMMUNITY" OFFERS CHALLENGE FOR INGENUITY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a major step forward in the development of the District of Columbia was announced recently by President Johnson when he called for the creation of a new community on the site of the National Training School for Boys.

The President envisions this development as "a new attractive and well-balanced community at a major gateway to the Nation's Capital."

This community will be well balanced, providing housing for approximately 1,500 low-income families, 2,200 moderate-income families, and 800 high-income families. A wide variety of services, including schools and shopping facilities, will be provided within the community.

It is intended this community will be compatible with a detailed land-use study of the area and will adhere to the 1985 comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia prepared by the National Capital Planning Commission.

And this community will use the best efforts of the Federal Government, the local government, private industry, and the people of the city. The President's plan contemplates the construction of much of this needed housing by private enterprise, using the turnkey process developed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development as the vehicle for constructing the housing.

Under this process, which saves both time and money, private developers will construct housing using their own plans and specifications, their own techniques and processes, and when the housing is finished, it will be purchased by the Federal Government through the local housing authority.

The President declared:

This new development in Washington can be the best of communities.

By combining the best talents of the public and private sector, this new community could well become "the best of communities." It offers a challenge for ingenuity.

JOHN BARRY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, each year I have supported the joint resolutions introduced in this House that if approved would authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating September 13 as John Barry Day, the anniversary of the death of one of our great naval heroes. I regret that such a measure has not yet been approved, and I shall continue to express my support for honoring the memory of John Barry.

Called by many "the father of the American Navy," John Barry served the United States with valor and devotion. On the 13th of September, 1803, this great hero of the Revolutionary War died at the age of 58 in Philadelphia. His distinguished naval career elicits the respect and the admiration of all Americans.

He was born at Ballysamps, Tacumshin Parish, County Wexford, Ireland. As a boy he went to sea and settled in Philadelphia in 1760. There he eventually became a notable shipmaster and an eventual shipowner. He displayed enthusiasm for the cause of the Colonies against British oppression and was placed in the command of the brig *Lexington* by the Continental Congress.

He captured the British sloop, *Edward*, on April 7, 1776, and on that date he addressed a dispatch headed "In sight of the Capes of Virginia, April 7, 1776," to the Marine Committee of the Continental Congress:

I have the pleasure to acquaint you that at one P.M. this day I fell in with the sloop *Edward*, belonging to the *Liverpool* frigate. She engaged us for near two [hour-] glasses. They killed two of our men, and wounded two more. We shattered her in a terrible manner as you will see. We killed and wounded several of her crew. I shall give you a particular account of the powder and arms taken out of her. . . . I have the pleasure to acquaint you, that all our people behaved with much courage.

John Barry exemplified the ability of the Colonists to contest the British vessels at sea, something many leaders of the cause had doubted could be done. He volunteered for duty with the American Army, and participated with distinction in the Trenton campaign. He was then given the command of the *Raleigh* with which he fought a gallant battle on September 25, 1778, in Penobscot Bay. He, finally obliged to beach his ship, saved most of his men from capture. On February 15, 1779, he assumed command of the brig *Delaware* and made two cruises to Haiti.

On February 11, 1781, Barry, commanding the *Alliance*, America's largest and finest vessel, sailed from Boston to France. En route, he captured the *Mars* and the *Minerva*, and he put down a mutiny on his own ship. After a fierce en-

gagement, he forced two British brigs, the *Atalanta* and the *Trepassey*, to strike their colors. Barry was badly wounded in the action.

To John Barry belongs the distinction of having gallantly fought in the last naval action of our War for Independence. Aboard the *Alliance*, he encountered the *Sybil* on March 10, as Barry was returning from Martinique in 1783. In 1803, John Barry, as commodore of the U.S. Navy, died. Today we salute the memory of John Barry, a great naval officer and a great American.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the September 1967 number of Nation's Business deserves strong emphasis and widespread attention. The editorial deals with the services of National Guard units. These units have been under fire in some quarters as being no longer useful. Some of us have been compelled to fight for their continued existence. We are happy to enlist the support of a publication which carries so much prestige as Nation's Business.

The editorial to which I refer reports approvingly the role of the National Guard in maintaining public order. The Guard is increasingly becoming our principal reliance in periods of riot and extreme disorder, when small local and State police forces are no longer able to control the situation. But this is by no means the only, or even the most important, public service of the Guard. In disasters great and small, whether from storms or fire or failure of various utility systems, the Guard is almost instantly on the scene, bringing succor to the helpless.

The Nation's Business editorial reads as follows:

"THANK GOD FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD"

That's what citizens all over the country are saying. The Guard has been called out to put down riots more than 40 times since the Little Rock incident a decade ago.

Every state has Guard units. Army National Guard now totals 417,000; Air Guard, 81,000.

Average Guardsman gets at least six hours special riot control training, how to get quickly into formations to break mobs into smaller bunches, for instance. Now they'll get more since LBJ's call for added training.

Military police units in Guard get more of this type training, of course. Guardsmen's tactical training also prepares them to fight rioting hoodlums. Generally they meet regular Army training requirements. Three out of four Guardsmen are under 25.

Guard could be even stronger in many states this fall when new reorganization takes effect to consolidate units and provide better distribution of equipment.

Though Pentagon for years has been trying to cut Guard strength, Congress has held out to keep Guard strong.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of official business—National Advisory Committee of Civil Disorders.

Mr. McMILLAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the rest of the week on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business—the President's Commission on Disorder.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico, for September 14, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ASHBROOK, today, for 15 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PUCINSKI, today, for 1 hour; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WAMPLER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, on September 14.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LONG of Maryland (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY), for 15 minutes, September 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CRAMER to include tables with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on S. 602.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WAMPLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. McDADE in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEE.

Mr. REES.

Mr. ELBERG.

Mr. CAREY.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1880. An act to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 43d biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 636. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin Shue Shiu;

S. 653. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crisp, U.S. Air Force; and

S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 14, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1070. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report of all expenditures during the period January 1, 1967, to June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1071. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting the 28th semiannual report of the U.S. Information Agency covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80-402; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1072. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a copy of personnel claims paid during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-185; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1073. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor, H.R. 478. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 1340. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of land for, and to construct, administer, and maintain an extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina and Georgia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 11576. A bill to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (40 Stat. 1094).

reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev. (Rept. No. 640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bill and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 12862. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12863. A bill to limit the quantity of baseball and softball gloves and mitts which may be imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 12864. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that the amount of groundfish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 12865. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 12866. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 12867. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain and national holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 12868. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 12869. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12870. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 12871. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prohibit projects and programs which compete with private retail and wholesale businesses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12872. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prohibit programs and projects involving the publication of newspapers in competition with private newspapers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 12873. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12874. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide survivor benefits for military career personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax to offset losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12876. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any fireman performing his duties during the course of any riot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12877. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 12878. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 12879. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to extend coverage to all classes of low-income families in Indian areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 12880. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12881. A bill to authorize the payment of allowances to defray commuting expenses of civilian employees of executive agencies assigned to duty at remote worksites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURTON of California (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. HOL-
LAND):

H.R. 12882. A bill to provide for the payment of administrative expenses for the safety program under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12883. A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of compensation payments under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 12884. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 12885. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 12886. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 12887. A bill to amend section 5042 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals who are not heads of families to produce wine for personal consumption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 12888. A bill to require consultation with local planning agencies with respect to proposed Federal construction projects

within their jurisdiction; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 12889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12890. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unmarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 1 year or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 12891. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to further limit political activity on the part of workers in poverty programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK (for himself and Mr. MATHIAS of California):

H.R. 12892. A bill to provide for credit to the Kings River Water Association and others for excess payments for the years 1954 and 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 816. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 817. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 818. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.J. Res. 319. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.J. Res. 820. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 821. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.J. Res. 822. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 823. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.J. Res. 824. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Res. 919. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to set aside a portion of the gallery for the use of scholars engaged in studies of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12893. A bill for the relief of Fran-

cresco Tortorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:
H.R. 12894. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Brunner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:
H.R. 12895. A bill for the relief of Adalbert Gardos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:
H.R. 12896. A bill for the relief of Francesco Bologna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:
H.R. 12897. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cucinotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable HERMAN E. TALMADGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Rev. Donald D. M. Jones, executive, Presbytery of Seattle, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Seattle, Wash., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, God of our fathers and Father of all peoples, we turn to Thee for wisdom and guidance as we face the complex issues of our society and our world.

May Thy wisdom guide us, may Thy spirit lead us, and may we respond with conviction that our country and our people may live with dignity and brotherly love to Thy glory.

In the name of Christ, we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1967.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TALMADGE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CXIII—1600—Part 19

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10738) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 14, 20, 21, and 36 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5091. An act to amend Public Law 87-752 (76 Stat. 749) to eliminate the requirement of a reservation of certain mineral rights to the United States; and

H.R. 11816. An act to provide certain benefits for law enforcement officers not employed by the United States who are killed or injured while apprehending violators of Federal law.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 90-70, the Speaker had appointed Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. Moss of California, Mr. BURTON of Utah, and Mr. BROZMAN of Colorado, as members of the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission, on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 163. An act for the relief of CWO Charles M. Bickart, U.S. Marine Corps (retired);

S. 636. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin Shee Shiu;

S. 653. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crisp, U.S. Air Force; and

S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 5091. An act to amend Public Law 87-752 (76 Stat. 749) to eliminate the requirement of a reservation of certain mineral rights to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11816. An act to provide certain benefits for law enforcement officers not employed by the United States who are killed or injured while apprehending violators of Federal law; placed on the calendar.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings

of Tuesday, September 12, 1967, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Rex Lee, of Idaho, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

PEACE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brent K. Ashabanner, of Okla-